SOME OLD LOST RĀMA PLAYS

(Lectures delivered in the Annamalai University)

By

Dr. V. RAGHAVAN, M. A., Ph. D.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Madras University,

Author of '*Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*', *New Catalogus Catalogorum*' *etc.*

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

ANNAMALAINAGAR

1961

SOME OLD LOST RĀMA PLAYS

(Lectures delivered in the Annamalai University)

By

Dr. V. RAGHAVAN, M. A., Ph. D.,

Professor of Sanskrit, Madras University,

Author of '*Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*', '*New Catalogus Catalogorum*' etc.

ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

ANNAMALAINAGAR

1961

Rs 1 50

Printed at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.

FOREWORD

"Some Old Lost Rāma Plays" was the subject of a course of three lectures delivered at the Annamalai University during March 1957 by Dr. V. Raghavan, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Madras. The Rāmāyaṇa, like the other epic, the Mahābhārata, has been for centuries exercising a rare influence and fascination over the playwrights in Sanskrit by affording them themes of perennial value and interest from its store-house of incidents and characters. These playwrights, taking an identical theme from the epic, produced dramatic works of unfading interest and charm by grafting a variety of permissible and effective innovations upon the original story. No less than a score of such works are now available in print. The Mahāvīracarita and the Uttararāmacarita of Bhavabhūti, the Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi of Śaktibhadra, the Anargharāghava of Murāri, the Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara and the Prasannarāghava of Jayadeva are the well-known ones among such works. Some of the Rāma-dramas are known only by their names quoted in later works; probably they have been irretrievably lost. Others have been partially saved by being preserved in the illustrative citations by authors of works on poetics and dramaturgy.

The author of these lectures has gone through the vast mass of such illustrative literature, in print as well as in manuscript, and collected together all the available references to Rāma-dramas, lying scattered

in them. Steeped in the technique of the Sanskrit dramatic lore, the author has, further, with true insight and critical acumen, fixed the references in appropriate places, and eventually from out of these stray and isolated pieces, has succeeded in evolving connected stories full of dramatic interest. Of such resurrected Rāma-plays, eight are presented here by the author,—appropriately beginning with "Rāmābhyudaya" and significantly ending with "Rāghavānanda"—, the details of the plot having been reconstructed with the help of and in accordance with the clues given by the writers on dramaturgy. The author further refers briefly to five more Rāma-plays and to stray Acts of some more plays of the class.

These plays are of absorbing interest and are bound to stimulate the interest and enthusiasm of scholars not only in tracing more of the missing links but also, as the author says, in discovering these plays, as well as others of this kind. Judged from the citations presented here, these plays deserve an honoured place among the dramas in Sanskrit. The credit of having salvaged the isolated pieces of these time-wrecked dramas strewn about in the vast mass of illustrative literature in Sanskrit and for having reconstructed the original stories by working out the links goes to the author of this work, and the world of scholars interested in the subject will remain grateful to him for this fruitful and fascinating study.

Dr. C. S. Venkateswaran, M. A., Ph. D.,
Professor & Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Annamalai University.

Annamalainagar,
6—1—1962

PREFACE

The material in the following pages formed the subject of three lectures which I delivered under the auspices of the Annamalai University in March, 1957. The Introduction has since been amplified and a section has been added in the end on some Rāma-plays and Acts of Rāma-plays on which only comparatively meagre information is available. I should express my thanks to the authorities of the Annamalai University, the former and the present Vice-Chancellors and the Head of the Sanskrit Department for inviting me to give this course under their scheme of special lectures, and for also publishing these lectures in the present form. Sri K. V. Sarma of my Department and Kumari D. C. Saraswati, Research Student in my Department, were helpful in the reading of the proofs and the preparation of the Index.

Punarvasu
24—12—1961
Madras University

V. RAGHAVAN

CONTENTS

		Pages
Foreword	...	i
Preface	...	iii
Table of contents	...	v
Introduction	...	vii–xiv
Yaśovarman's Rāmābhyudaya	...	1—25
The Kṛtyārāvaṇa	...	26—49
The Chalitarāma	...	50—59
The Jānakīrāghava	...	60—73
The Rāghavābhyudaya	...	74—81
The Rāmānanda	...	82—87
The Māyāpuṣpaka	...	88—91
The Rāghavānanda	...	92—93
Some more Rāma-plays:		
The Svapnadaśānana of Bhīmaṭa	...	93
The Abhijātajānakī	...	93—95
The Abhinavarāghava	...	95—96
The Mārīcavañcita	...	96
The Rāmavikrama	...	96—97
Stray Acts of some more Rāma-plays:		
The Ayodhyābharata	...	97—98
The Kekayībharata	...	98
The Daśarathāṅka	...	98—99
The Prāvṛḍaṅka	...	99–100
The Vibhīṣaṇanirbhartsanāṅka	...	100
The Śaktyaṅka	...	100–102
The Sampātyaṅka	...	102–103
Index	...	105–123
Bibliography	...	124–126
Errata	...	127

INTRODUCTION

The subject of these lectures had long fascinated me and I am sure others too, students of Sanskrit as well as of the general history of Sanskrit literature, will feel interested in it. One of the phenomena in the history of Sanskrit literature that is bound to strike any student, whatever the branch of it that he is working in, is that the appearance of a genius or of some outstanding production in a field threw into oblivion most, if not all of the earlier productions in that field. This is true of the department of Sanskrit drama too. The modest bow with which Kālidāsa, in his Mālavikāgnimitra, made his debut on the Sanskrit stage meant also the exit of Bhāsa, Saumilla and Kaviputra, the earlier celebrities *(prathitayaśasaḥ)* who were holding the Sanskrit stage. The phenomenon could be pursued in the still further specialised field of a particular class of Sanskrit drama, such as we are to consider here. The two Epics, described in their own texts as '*Ādi-kāvyam*' and '*param kavīnām ādhāram*' have always served as the theme-source for Sanskrit dramatists. Plays based on the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata had been composed in a large number but the appearance of Bhavabhūti and his two Rāmāyaṇa plays and of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and his Mahābhārata play had eclipsed all earlier compositions in these two classes of plays. What has been thus lost is not only considerable in number but also noteworthy in point of merit.

Glimpses of the rich repertoire of the Sanskrit theatre which had suffered loss by the passage of time and the vicissitudes of literary history, are afforded to us by the encyclopaedic writings of some of the leading Sanskrit critics who have, for purposes of illustration in their works of dramaturgy or commentaries thereon, drawn from a vast field of dramatic literature. The most fruitful sources from which one could reconstruct the lost pages of the history of Sanskrit Drama are the Abhinavabhāratī, the commentary of Abhinavagupta on the Nāṭya Śāstra, the Avaloka of Dhanika on the Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya, the Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa of King Bhoja, the Vakroktijīvita of Kuntaka, the Nāṭyadarpaṇa of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, the Nāṭakalakṣaṇa-ratnakośa of Sāgaranandin, the Bhāvaprakāśa of Śāradātanaya and the Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha. With the help of these works which quote significant and sometimes long extracts from the lost plays, it is possible for us now to know more fully the nature, extent and achievement of specific classes of Sanskrit drama. Already I have shown this in respect of the class of Sanskrit drama called *Prakaraṇa*, the social play,[1] and now I propose to show this in respect of the first, the Nāṭaka or the heroic play. In this class again, on the present occasion, I shall confine myself to plays based on the Rāmāyaṇa-theme.

The Nāṭaka type of play requires for its theme a story that is celebrated or well-known, primarily in the Itihāsas and Purāṇas and the annals of the

1. See my *Social Play in Sanskrit*, Indian Institute of World Culture, Bangalore, 1952.

Rājarṣis; the Itivṛtta of this type of drama should be *prakhyāta.* Among themes of such celebrated nature, the story of Rāma had exercised the utmost fascination on the playwrights. If they repeatedly went to the Rāmāyaṇa for their themes, the only answer is what the authors of two well-known Rāma-plays Murāri and Jayadeva gave. The former says in the prologue to his 'Priceless Rāghava':—

अयं तु प्राचेतसीयं कथावस्तु बहुभिः प्रणीतमपि प्रयुञ्जानो नापराध्यति श्रोत्रियपुत्रः । पश्य –

यदि क्षुण्णं पूर्वैरिति जहति रामस्य चरितं
गुणैरेतावद्भिर्जगति पुनरन्यो जयति कः ।
स्वमात्मानं तत्तद्गुणगरिमगम्भीरमधुर-
स्फुरद्वाग्ब्रह्माणः कथमुपकरिष्यन्ति कवयः ॥

— Anargharāghava, Prologue, Śl. 9.

The 'Gracious Rāghava' of the latter poet says:—

कथं पुनरमी कवयः सर्वेऽपि रामचन्द्रमेव वर्णयन्ति? नायं कवीनां दोषः । यतः –

स्वसूक्तीनां पात्रं रघुतिलकमेकं कलयतां
कवीनां को दोषः स तु गुणगणानामवगुणः ।
यदेतैर्निःशेषैरपरगुणलुब्धैरिव जग-
त्यसावेकश्चक्रे सततसुखसंवासवसतिः ॥

अपि च भोः!

बीजं यस्य चिरार्जितं सुचरितं प्रज्ञा नवीनोऽङ्कुरः
काण्डं पण्डितमण्डलीपरिचयः काव्यं नवः पल्लवः ।

कीर्तिः पुष्पपरम्परा परिणतः सोऽयं कवित्वद्रुमः
किं वन्ध्यः क्रियते विना रघुकुलोत्तंसप्रशंसाफलम् ॥

— Prasannarāghava, Prologue, Śls. 12, 13.

The repeated use of the same well-known theme does not necessarily make the plays hackneyed. In the very conception of the Nāṭaka, the condition that it shall have a well-known theme is further qualified by the statement '*Kiñcit utpādya-vastu ca*',—'together with an element of originality and innovation,' a condition on which Mātṛgupta laid some stress in his Nāṭya treatise. The poets took the cue from the dictum 'kiñcit utpādya-vastu ca' and each one of them tried to show his ingenuity in one direction or other, and by the time of Ānandavardhana, as we shall see presently, this tendency to innovate and try to improve upon Vālmīki had gone to such an extent that the reputed critic had to sound a note of warning. For such innovations add to the interest of the plot only when they are within bounds. As Yaśovarman the dramatist, whose lost Rāma-play we shall deal with first, observed, 'Ati-krama' or 'too much interference' with the established course of the story was not desirable.

The following studies in the Rāma-plays is also a study of the extent and nature of the variations which the imagination of the playwrights worked on the story of the Rāmāyaṇa. Broadly speaking the efforts at originality of these poets manifest themselves in two directions: One is to save, so to say, the character of those dramatis personae whose behaviour on some occasions, in the original story,

has been the subject of controversy and criticism: Daśaratha and Kaikeyī on the occasion of the proposed coronation and eventual exile of Rāma; the episode of Rāma going after the palpably illusory golden deer; Sītā's unbecoming words to Lakṣmaṇa and Rāvaṇa carrying her off; Rāma killing Vālin and in the end repudiating Sītā who undergoes the fire-ordeal. The other is the full exploitation of the idea of magic, deceit and false impersonation that the Rākṣasas are capable of and of which the original story itself has some examples of vital importance; allied to this is the fuller working out of the idea of enmity between the Rākṣasas and those of Rāma's side, utilizing the machinery of the Arthaśāstra and bringing on of Rāvaṇa to the very opening sequences of the theme like the Svayamvara of Sītā and the letting loose of his demon and demoness emissaries, in different kinds of impersonations, on those of Ayodhyā and Mithilā. This machinery is employed on the battlefield, as also, in one of the plays to be dealt with, in the story of the Uttara-kāṇḍa. The actual details of each of these variations and the interest they impart to the plot by creating moments of tenseness, suspense and surprise can be appreciated as we go along with each of these lost Rāma-plays. Suffice it to point out here that these variations do reveal the resourcefulness of these poets who produced so many plays on the same theme. Says Kuntaka in his Vakroktijīvita:

एकामेव कामपि कन्दलितकामनीयकां कथां निर्वहद्भिः बहुभिरपि कविकुञ्जरैः निबध्यमाना बहवः प्रबन्धा मनागप्यन्योन्यसंवादनमना-

सादयन्तं सहृदयहृदयाह्लादकं कमपि वक्रिमाणमादधति । यथा रामाभ्युदय–उदात्तराघव–वीरचरित–बालरामायण–कृत्यारावण–मायापुष्पक-प्रभृतयः । ते हि प्रबन्धप्रवरास्तेनैव कथामार्गेण निरर्गलरसासारगर्भसंपदा प्रतिपदं प्रतिवाक्यं प्रतिप्रकरणं च प्रकाशमानाभिनवभङ्गीप्राया ... भ्राजिष्णवो नवनवोन्मीलितनायकगुणोत्कर्षास्तेषां हर्षातिरेकमनेकशोऽप्यास्वाद्यमानाः समुत्पादयन्ति सहृदयानाम् ।

These variations are of further interest to a student of the versions of the Rāmāyaṇa, for some of these variations initiated in the plays–which were of popular appeal–appear in the other, later or popular versions of the epic in Sanskrit or in the regional languages of the country,–Rāmā and Sītā having a glimpse of each other before the breaking of the bow and the development thereby of some amount of Pūrvānurāga-vipralambha as technically required, Aṅgada as Rāma's messenger on the eve of the war dragging Maṇḍodarī by the hair and teasing her, and so on. The variations, however, do not form the only noteworthy feature of these plays. They are, as can be seen from the available glimpses, noteworthy productions as dramas; written in a simple style which however does not lack literary quality, and giving scope for action and due prominence to the emotions, these plays are indeed such that Sanskrit dramatic literature is really poorer by their loss.

As already stated, many of the lost Rāma-plays are cited rather copiously. I have therefore, as on the previous occasions,[1] collected together all the extracts

1. See the *Social Play in Sanskrit* already referred to; also the *Devīcandragupta*, J. of the Benaras Hindu University, II. (1937-8), pp. 23-54, 307.

and references and reconstructed, as fully as possible, the plays, the way they have been conceived and the progress and details of the plot Act by Act. The order of the plays considered in these lectures has been arranged from this point of view, those of which more extensive views are possible being placed earlier. The pride of place naturally goes to the Rāmābhyudaya of King Yaśovarman of Kanauj, the patron of Bhavabhūti and next in importance come the Kṛtyārāvaṇa and Chalitarāma. After dealing with some more plays, extracts from some of which are many and from others few, I have noticed also a few on which the available information is very meagre and some titles of stray Acts which are cited from unidentifiable Rāma-plays.

The sources from which I have resurrected these plays and their themes and other details have been already mentioned and they have also been set forth in the Bibliography and Abbreviations. I have, as it is obvious, concerned myself only with the productions of the classical period and the lost masterpieces referred to in the standard Alaṁkāra and Nāṭya works, extending from Abhinavagupta and Bhoja to Sāgaranandin and Viśvanātha. One of the important early Rāma-plays which a close student of Sanskrit dramaturgy will miss in my account is the Udāttarāghava of Anaṅgaharṣa Māyurāja; I have left this out in these reconstructions, as I have since been lucky enough to discover a manuscript of it. And I hope these lectures on the lost dramatic masterpieces on the Rāmāyaṇa-theme will indirectly create

sufficient interest in them and lead to the eventual discovery of their manuscripts.

YAŚOVARMAN'S RĀMĀBHYUDAYA

Perhaps the best of our lost Rāma-plays is the Rāmābhyudaya of King Yaśovarman, the patron of Bhavabhūti and Vākpati, in the former part of the 8th century A. D. Dr. Keith says after examining some verses from this drama that "we may regret the loss of a work which contained verses as pretty as these, even on the outworn topic of Rāma and Sītā"[1]. The name Yaśovarman is seen in the anthologies, the Sūktimuktāvali, the Subhāṣitāvali and the Śārṅgadharapaddhati. Peterson's Introduction to Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣitāvali contains a note on Yaśovarman in which some verses attributed to him are collected and his lost drama, the Rāmābhyudaya, is mentioned. There is a brief note on the Rāmābhyudaya of Yaśovarman by Sri R. Ramamurty in the J. O. R., Madras, III. pp. 268–272. The Rāmābhyudaya must have been a very widely known play as the numerous references to it and quotations from it in works of poetics and dramaturgy show. These references and citations are ample and informing enough, enabling us to know the author of the play, the number of its Acts and the story of the play, Act by Act. A complete account and reconstruction of the play are now given.

(1) That its author is Yaśovarman is shown by references in the 3rd Uddyota of Ānandavardhana's

1. *Sanskrit Drama p. 222.*

Dhvanyāloka (Dhva. Ā.) and Abhinavagupta's Locana. In connection with Prabandha-dhvani, Ānandavardhana remarks that the course of the original story may be changed for the sake of Rasa but in the case of stories such as that of the Rāmāyaṇa which is brimful with Rasa even as it is, one must not meddle too much with the trend of the story, introduce innovations as one pleases and spoil the Rasa. (3.11 Kārikā and Vṛtti; p. 144 and 148).[1] He says:—

सन्ति सिद्धरसप्रख्या ये च रामायणादयः ।
कथाश्रया न तैर्योज्या स्वेच्छा रसविरोधिनी ॥

तेषु कथाश्रयेषु तावत् स्वेच्छैव न योज्या । यदुक्तं-'कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः ।'

Commenting on this, Abhinavagupta says:—

यदुक्तमिति । रामाभ्युदये यशोवर्मणा ।

I have given above the purified text of the Locana and not the text as printed in the Nirnayasagar edition. The Nirnayasagar edition reads:—

यदुक्तमिति । रामाभ्युदये यशोवर्मणा-'स्थितमिति यथा शय्यां-'

This makes one think that besides the bit quoted by Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta quotes a further bit, viz., स्थितमिति यथा शय्याम्. The quotation marks and fullstop-mark in the middle have misled some scholars; for instance it has been taken that the bit quoted by Ānandavardhana "कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः" represents a foot of an Anuṣṭubh, requiring

1. Nirnayasagar Press edition of 1928.

the emendation of अतिक्रमः into अक्रमः ,—' कथामार्गे न चाक्रमः ' and consequently the quotation-like passage in Locana ' स्थितिमति यथा शय्यां ' has been emended into ' स्थितिमति यथा शय्यां ' and taken as the other foot of the Anuṣṭubh line, though a lame one.

The Sṛṅgāra Prakāśa (Śṛ. Pra.) of Bhoja has helped me here to correct the text of the Locana in the N. S. Press edn. and also the *ad hoc* reconstructions proposed for these quotations in the Dhva. Ā. and Locana. In indentification of the person and the work referred to by Ānandavardhana in his words यदुक्तम् , Abhinavagupta says रामाभ्युदये यशोवर्मणा. The text should have a fullstop here. The fullstop and the quotation marks for स्थितमिति यथा शय्याम् should disappear and this part of the text should be corrected. The bit स्थितमिति is a mistake for स्थितिमिति and it should be printed in bold type, for it is Pratīkagrantha. The "Sthiti" here is the word in Ānandavardhana's Vṛtti इतिवृत्तवशायातां कथञ्चित् रसाननुगुणां स्थितिं etc. This word "Sthiti" is interpreted by Abhinavagupta as 'the course of the story'; the text printed with two separate words ' यथा शय्यां ' must be corrected into one of a single word with "Kathā" in the place of "yatha". स्थितिमिति । कथाशय्याम् । The Locana should thus read :—

यदुक्तमिति । रामाभ्युदये यशोवर्मणा । स्थितिमिति । कथाशय्याम ।

Therefore no Anuṣṭubh is playing hide and seek in the Locana. Nor is there any necessity to prune the 'Atikrama' in the bit quoted by Ānandavardhana into 'Akrama' to give us an Anuṣṭubh foot.

"कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः" is the correct text. It forms part of the latter portion of a line of a verse in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre.

(2) Before going to the full Śārdūlavikrīḍita verse of which the quotation in Ānandavardhana is a bit, we must pause to consider the significance of this reference in Ānandavardhana which quotes a dictum laid down by Yaśovarman in his Rāmābhyudaya. The dictum of Yaśovarman is quoted by Ānandavardhana to support what has been said by himself that in stories such as that of the Rāmāyaṇa, the poet must not seriously tamper with the course of the original story. Yaśovarman's dictum is "No transgressing of the natural course of the story", कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः। This dictum occurs in the midst of the enumeration of a number of good features of a drama, which Yaśovarman gives in a verse and which he takes credit for as present in his own play. From this it is clear that Yaśovarman wrote his play as a protest to other Rāma-plays whose authors presumed to improve upon Vālmīki and played at ducks and drakes with his story. Yaśovarman's court-poet, Bhavabhūti himself took liberties with Vālmīki to some extent in his Mahāvīracarita. We can suppose that the authors of the Kṛtyārāvaṇa and the Chalitarāma, to be dealt with in this course of lectures, preceded Yaśovarman and Bhavabhūti. They let out their powers of innovation on such episodes of the Rāmāyaṇa as they thought called for improvement, e.g., the situation in which Sītā abuses Lakṣmaṇa, sent him after Rāma who had gone chasing the golden deer and was herself carried away

by Rāvaṇa, the episode of Vāli-vadha and so on. Authors made such innovations out of too much piety and the complacent thought that they were saving the character of Rāma and Sītā. Anaṅgaharṣa Māyurāja's Udāttarāghava made Lakṣmaṇa go after the golden deer. In a later period, Rājaśekhara wrote the Bāla Rāmāyaṇa and tried to save the character of Kaikeyī and Daśaratha in an Act of the play entitled Nirdoṣa-Daśaratha. This tendency to improve upon Vālmīki persisted till a very late period when poets like Rāmabhadradīkṣita wrote plays like the Jānakīpariṇaya. Yaśovarman disliked all such innovations and found ample emotional interest in the way in which Vālmīki dealt with the story in his epic. He dramatised the story from the Pañcavaṭī to the Paṭṭābhiṣeka without spoiling the original Rasa, without letting loose on Vālmīki his own "svecchā". Corroborative evidence on this point comes from the Ms. of Bahurūpamiśra's Daśarūpakavyākhyā (Mad. Ms. R. 4188) which says that Yaśovarman did not resort to the new way in which Murāri killed Vālin. Bahurūpamiśra says:—

यथा अनर्घराघवे वालिवधोऽन्यथाकृतः रामाभ्युदये परित्यक्तः । P. 32

In Act 5 of the Anargharāghava of Murāri, Rāma himself meets Vālin, their talk leads them on to the fight, they themselves then fight together and Rāma kills Vālin; Hanumān and Sugrīva, Guha and Lakṣmaṇa who are onlookers on the stage inform us of the fight taking place in the *nepathya*. What did Yaśovarman do with the episode of Vālivadha?

Bahurūpa says that he did not do it in a manner different from that of Vālmīki (अन्यथा); but does Bahurūpa mean to say by his words 'रामाभ्युदये परित्यक्तः', that Yaśovarman left it altogether? The dramatist could not have completely eliminated it from his plot and it is certain he did not also change it in any manner. There is a reference followed by a quotation in the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (NLRK) of a speech of Vālin engaged or to be engaged in duel; Vālin speaks of his own prowess. NLRK 3126–9:—

आत्मनः पौरुषप्रतिपादनं वैशारद्यम् । यथा रामाभ्युदये वाली –

क्षयानलशिखाजालविकरालजटावलिः ।
दृश्यते न द्विपैः सिंहः क्रुद्धो वाली न वैरिभिः ॥

On p. 222 of his *Sanskrit Drama* Dr. Keith says :– "It might be interesting to know whether Yaśovarman was successful in introducing any new element into the established plot". None who had seen the reference in the Dhvanyāloka to Yaśovarman's Rāmābhyudaya,—and Keith seems to have, as apparent from p. 220 of his book,—would have any doubts on this question. For Ānandavardhana quotes Yaśovarman himself to say that he made no transgression (Atikrama) of the 'established' story (Kathā–mārga).

(3) Now, the full verse of which "कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः" quoted by Ānandavardhana forms a part. The verse itself is anonymously quoted by Bhoja and it can be identified as a verse from Yaśovarman's Rāmābhyudaya with the help of what

Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta have said. The verse has at the end of the first half the bit "कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः", which Abhinavagupta attributes to the Rāmābhyudaya of Yaśovarman.

The context in which the Śṛ. Pra. quotes this verse is the consideration of a set of good features of a Prabandha taken as a whole. Bhoja treats of Rasa under two heads, the Rasa in a Vākya, Vākya-rasāviyoga, and the Rasa in the work as a whole, Prabandha-rasāviyoga. The Aviyoga or non-divorce of Rasa in both cases is achieved by avoiding flaws (Doṣa-hāna) and securing Guṇas and Alaṁkāras (Guṇālaṁkāra-yoga). Bhoja has two sets of Doṣas, Guṇas and Alaṁkāras, those of the Vākya and those of the Prabandha. When Guṇas and Alaṁkāras are secured after the elimination of flaws, the work becomes "excellent in build". It is to reinforce this point with a quotation that Bhoja gives the verse from the Rāmābhyudaya of Yaśovarman:—

"—सन्निवेशप्राशस्त्यं अलङ्कारसङ्कर इति । तदुक्तम् —

औचित्यं वचसां प्रकृत्यनुगतं, सर्वत्र पात्रोचिता
पुष्टिस्स्वावसरे रसस्य च, **कथामार्गे न चातिक्रमः** ।
शुद्धिः प्रस्तुतसंविधानकविधौ प्रौढिश्च शब्दार्थयोः
विद्वद्भिः परिभाव्यतामवहितैरेतावदेवास्तु नः ॥

—p. 411. Vol. II. Śṛ. Pra.

This verse is of further significance to us since it is the only fragment available to us from the Prastāvanā of the Rāmābhyudaya. For this verse can appear nowhere else than in the prologue. It is

also interesting to compare this verse with a similar one in the prologue to his court poet Bhavabhūti's Mālatīmādhava, यद्वेदाध्ययनं etc., especially in the second half:—

यत्प्रौढत्वमुदारता च वचसां यच्चार्थतो गौरवं
तच्चेदस्ति ततस्तदेव गमकं पाण्डित्यवैदग्ध्ययोः ।

The expression विद्वद्भिः परिभाव्यतामवहितैः in Yaśovarman can be compared with the expression in the *Bharata-vākya* in Bhavabhūti's Uttararāmacarita— तामेतां परिभावयन्तु ... ... बुधाः ।

Above all, this verse of Yaśovarman in the prologue to his Rāmābhyudaya interests us in two other aspects. It contains the earliest expression of the idea and word Aucitya and it is not necessary to repeat here what I have said of this in the chapter on Aucitya in my book *Concepts of Alaṁkāra Śāstra.* The other aspect is the mention of the Guṇa called Prauḍhi of Śabda and Artha, a Guṇa occurring in the verse of Bhavabhūti also, यत् प्रौढत्वं etc., and which in Alaṁkāra literature appears only in Vāmana. I have explained this in the chapter on the History of Guṇas in my book *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa.*

To pass on now to the references to and extracts from the Rāmābhyudaya in works of poetics and dramaturgy:—Quotations from his play are found in the Dhva. Ā, and Locana, the Abhinavabhāratī (Abhi. Bhā.), the Daśarūpakāvaloka (DRA), the Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa (Śṛ. Pra.), the Bhāvaprakāśa (Bhā. Pra.) the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND) of Rāmacandra

and Guṇacandra, the Sāhityadarpaṇa (SD), the Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (NLRK) of Sāgaranandin, and the Anthologies. If we collate all these references and extracts an adequate view of the Rāmābhyudaya can be had.

(4) The Rāmābhyudaya is a Nāṭaka. Its theme itself shows that it belongs to the first type of drama, the Nāṭaka.

(5) It is a Nāṭaka in six Acts. Not only do we have no extracts mentioned as taken from the 7th Act, 8th Act and so on (which is but negative evidence of doubtful value) but we have also the definite affirmation by Śāradātanaya that the Rāmābhyudaya is a Nāṭaka in six Acts.

षडंकं दृश्यते लोके रामाभ्युदयनाटकम् । —P. 237 Bhā. Pra.

(6) We have only one verse from the Prastāvanā of the play and it has been given above. Śāradātanaya refers to the announcement of the play in the Prastāvanā by the Sūtradhāra "रामाभ्युदयं नाम नाटकं" etc." on p. 200. Of a similar nature is a reference to the Rāmābhyudaya in the Sāhityadarpaṇa (p. 330, N. S. Press edn. 1922).

(7) The extent of the story of the play is from the Āraṇyakāṇḍa to the end of the Yuddhakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa. The play opens in Pañcavaṭī where Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā are leading the exile-life and ends with Rāma's coronation.

The exact end of the play is definitely known. Śāradātanaya says that the Nirvahaṇa, the last Sandhi, of the Rāmābhyudaya is the coronation of Rāma at

2.

Ayodhyā which is attended by Sugrīva, Vibhīṣaṇa, and the other monkeys and Rākṣasas.

... ... तन्निर्वहणमुच्यते ।
यथा हि **रामाभ्युदये** सुग्रीवश्च विभीषणः ।
कपयो राक्षसा रामाभिषेकाभ्युदयं ययुः ॥ — Bhā. Pra. p. 212

That the Rāmābhyudaya did not embrace the story of the Uttarakāṇḍa, the banishment of Sītā and the Aśvamedha is certain and is known from the following observation of Abhinavagupta in his Abhinavabhāratī:

रामाभ्युदये सीताप्रत्यानयनादेरिव । न हि तत्र अश्वमेधयागादेः नायकोचितस्य कविविवक्षितत्वमस्ति[1] ।

—Mad. Ms. Vol. II. p. 491; GOS. edn. III. p. 5

The Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND) says that the story in Act V. of the play is the great battle. The exact quotation gives Rāma lamenting on seeing Rāvaṇa cutting off the head of Māyā Sītā. The battle is yet to be fought and there is but an Act remaining. It is impossible to finish in one Act the war, the coronation, life at the Capital, the banishment of Sītā, her forest life, Vālmīki composing his immortal epic and training the two sons of Sītā to recite it, the Aśvamedha and the reunion. This also shows that the Rāmābhyudaya did not include the story of the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa.

1. The correct meaning of the above passage has not been made out and it has been said that Abhinavagupta here proves the fact that Yaśovarman dramatised the Uttarakāṇḍa story also (JOR III. p. 271). The Nirvahaṇa is the end of a play and if the Nirvahaṇa of the Rāmābhyudaya is the coronation of Rāma to which Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa go with their followers, how can the play extend to the further story of the Uttarakāṇḍa?

In this connection, there is only one reference, which however seems to have set many on the wrong tract. It is a reference in the Daśarūpakāvaloka (DRA) and the ND. Illustrating Chalana or Avamānana, the Avaloka says:—

यथा च रामाभ्युदये सीतायाः परित्यागेन अवमाननात् छलनम् । —P. 29

The ND. gives this reference to illustrate this same point on p. 95. Dr. Keith notes this reference and deduces from it (p. 223. Skr. Drama) "Sītā's abandonment by Rāma as an act of duty." If Keith is thinking of Sītā's banishment into the forest as told in the Uttarakāṇḍa, he is wrong. The Sītā-parityāga and the Avamānana and Chalana of Sītā here refer to the repudiation of Sītā by Rāma on the battlefield of Laṅkā, after the victory, on exactly the same grounds, advanced not by any of the lower folk in Ayodhyā but by Rāma himself. Rāma refuses to take Sītā back and Sītā asks Lakṣmaṇa to prepare fire so that she may enter it. The fire-ordeal proves her virtue and she is then taken back. Gods appear and attest to her virtue. Then all happily leave for Ayodhyā for the coronation. The ND. gives an extract bearing on this fire-ordeal in the Rāmābhyudaya on p. 109. Thus it is settled that the Rāmābhyudaya extends from the Śūrpaṇakhā episode at Pañcavaṭī to Rāma's coronation at Ayodhyā after the war.

Regarding the exact beginning of the drama, we cannot be as sure as about its end. The following are the references at our disposal to say anything of the exact beginning of the play and the story of Act I,

(a) Bahurūpamiśra says in his Daśarūpakavyākhyā (P. 33 Mad. Ms.)

यथा रामाभ्युदयोपक्रमे शूर्पणखानासिकाकृन्तनादिवस्तुविस्तरः रामरावण(विरोधोपक्षेपक)तया उपक्षिप्तः नीरसश्च विष्कंभकेनैव सूचितः ।

(b) Abhinavagupta says while commenting on the 'Kapota-hasta' in Hastābhinaya chapter of the Nāṭya Śāstra :—

"तथाभि (हि) रामाभ्युदये प्रथमेऽङ्के वटोः कुचाभिनये अयमेव;प्रधानं वक्षस्थ इति सर्वत्र संबध्यते (?) ।"

— Abhi. Bhā. Mad. Ms. Vol. II P. 299 GOS. edn. II. P. 56

(c) The Upakṣepa is the first Aṅga of the first Sandhi in the first Act of a play. Abhinavagupta gives "fear" as the Upakṣepa in Rāmābhyudaya :

यथा रामाभ्युदये भयात्मा उपक्षेपः ।

— Abhi. Bhā. Vol. II. P. 531 GOS. edn. III p. 64

The ND. also gives this same reference on p. 116.

Is the 'fear' meant here the fear of the sages of the forest from the Rākṣasas, Śūrpaṇakhā, Khara, and Rāvaṇa? Or is it Rāvaṇa's fear on hearing of Rāma insulting Śūrpaṇakhā and annihilating Khara and his army? What does the second reference given by Abhinavagupta mean? A Brahmacārin is mentioned as doing the gesture (Abhinaya) for Kuca, i.e. 'breasts', in Act I. Evidently the scene is the Āśrama in Pañcavaṭī and the breasts refer to Śūrpaṇakhā's whose disfigured form the young boys are laughing at. By Act I, Abhinavagupta may mean a Viṣkambhaka to Act I proper. Bahurūpa would give evidence for a Viṣkambhaka at the beginning, giving us the

Śūrpaṇakhā episode, which he definitely says is not actually presented on the stage but is reported as having taken place. The characters in this Viṣkambhaka must be Brahmacārins and some sages of the hermitages of Pañcavaṭī.

On p. 325 of Hemacandra's own commentary on his Kāvyānuśāsana, there is an extract from the Rāmābhyudaya, given to illustrate Ākāśabhāṣita:

यथा रामाभ्युदये–तापसः (आकाशे) भावाद्वले(?)त्का(का)-वकाशे रामभद्रस्तिष्ठति । किं ब्रवीषि? तस्या एव पथिकजनमनोहारिण्याः पुष्करिण्याः परिसरे सीतया लक्ष्मणेन च सह न्यग्रोधच्छायायां सुखोपविष्टस्तिष्ठति ।

This may be at the beginning of Act I or II.

The story of the IInd Act may be sought here to decide what has been depicted in the Ist. The Śṛ. Pra. and the ND. quote from the second Act an extract showing Rāvaṇa sitting in council and asking Mārīca to aid him to carry off Sītā. Therefore, we must have some matter for Act I and cannot hold the whole of the Śūrpaṇakhā episode as done off the Stage. Perhaps, only the cutting of her nose by Lakṣmaṇa takes place off the Stage. The other incident referred to by 'ādi' in Bahurūpamiśra's remark शूर्पणखानासिकाकृन्तन-आदिवस्तुविस्तर is the annihilation of Khara and his hordes by Rāma. These two form the excitants of Rāvaṇa's enmity towards Rāma.

(8) Act II. Rāvaṇa is in court, Śūrpaṇakhā arrives with her nose cut or Rāvaṇa orders the court to meet, having already learnt about the insult to his

sister and the destruction of his kinsmen. Rāvaṇa resolves to carry off Sitā and asks Mārica's help. Mārica refuses at first, pointing out that Rāma was a great man. The dialogue between Rāvaṇa and Mārica is given as illustration of Asatpralāpa (on the side of Rāvaṇa) in the Śṛ. Pra. and the ND. Says Bhoja :—

मूर्खजनसन्निकर्षे हितमपि यत्र प्रभाषते विद्वान् ।
न च गृह्यतेऽस्य वचनं विज्ञेयोऽसत्प्रलापोऽसौ ॥

यथा रामाभ्युदये द्वितीयेऽङ्के—

रावणः — प्रायः श्रुतमेव etc. —P. 471 Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II. Mad. Ms.

Since there are gaps in the passage as quoted in the Śṛ. Pra., I give it as quoted in the ND. p. 144, to illustrate Asatpralāpa :

तत्र अविवेचकं प्रति यथा रामाभ्युदये द्वितीयेऽङ्के—

रावणः — प्रायशः श्रुतमेव भवद्भिः यथा कलत्रमात्रसाधनः असौ तापसः, तदपहार एव तावन्निरूप्यताम् । न च कलत्रापहरणादृते पुरुषस्य अपरं परिभवस्थानमस्ति । तत्र मारीचेन साहायकं क्रियमाणमिच्छामि ।

मारीचः — स्वामिन्! जीवतो रामस्य परिभव इत्यशक्यमेतत् । न खलु तापस इति तमवज्ञातुमर्हति देवः । अन्यदेव वस्त्वन्तरं किमपि तत् ।

रावणः — (सक्रोधम्) आः किं नाम वस्त्वन्तरं तत्? मूढ!

युक्त्यैव क्षत्रबन्धोः परिभवमसमं जीवतः कर्तुमिच्छन्
मायासाहायके त्वं निपुणतर इति प्रार्थये नासमर्थः ।
यच्चान्यत् तत्र वज्रप्रहतिमसृणितस्फारकेयूरभाजः
सज्जास्त्रैलोक्यलक्ष्मीहठहरणसहा बाहवो रावणस्य ॥

अत्र मारीचवचनं परमार्थतो हितमपि रावणेन नावगतम् ॥

A further part of the dialogue in the same situation is also quoted by the ND. as illustration of the appeasing of the angry (p. 72):

क्रुद्धस्य अनुकूलनम् । यथा **रामाभ्युदये द्वितीयेऽङ्के** —

मारीचः — नायमनुवृत्तिवचसाम् अवसरः । परिस्फुटं विज्ञाप्यते ।

दाराणां व्रतिनां च रक्षणविधौ वीरोऽनुयोज्यानुजं
वीराणां खरदूषणत्रिशिरसामेको वधं यो व्यधात् ।
तस्याखण्डिततेजसः कुलजने न्यक्कारमाविष्कृतः
कुण्ठः संगरदुर्मदस्य भवतः स्याच्चन्द्रहासोऽप्यसिः ॥

रावणः — आः प्रतिपक्षपक्षपातिन्! क्षुद्र! राक्षसापसद! किं बहुना—

तवैव रुधिरांबुभिः क्षतकठोरकण्ठस्रुतै
रिपुस्तुतिभवो मम प्रशममेतु कोपानलः ।
सुरद्विपशिरस्स्थलीदलनदष्टमुक्ताफलः
स्वसुः परिभवोचितं पुनरसौ विधास्यत्यसिः ॥

(इति खड्गमाकर्षति ।)

प्रहस्तः (पादयोर्निपत्य) प्रसीदतु प्रसीदतु महाराजः । नेदमनुरूपं स्वामिनः । देव!

लोकत्रयक्षयोद्वृत्तप्रकोपाग्रेसरस्य ते ।
ईदृशश्चन्द्रहासस्य भृत्येष्वनुचितः क्रमः ॥

(पुनः क्रमादाह) देव, प्रसीद । प्रणयादतिक्रमोऽस्य, न वामतया ।

इति मारीचं प्रति क्रुद्धस्य रावणस्य प्रहस्तविहितोऽयमनुनयः सान्त्वनम् । वज्रमप्यत्र प्रसंगात्प्रयुक्तं 'कुण्ठः संगरदुर्मदस्य भवतः स्याच्चन्द्रहासोऽप्यसिः' इत्यस्य प्रत्यक्षनिष्ठुरत्वात् ।

Śāradātanaya also refers to this Asatpralāpa of Rāvaṇa in the Rāmābhyudaya:—

यदा हि रामाभ्युदये सीतापहरणोद्यतः ।
मारीचेन सहायेन निषिद्धो रावणः क्रुधा ।
प्रालपद्विपरीतं यदसल्लापः स उच्यते ॥

—Bhā. Pra. Pp. 232–3

There is a single extract from the IIIrd Act which is a verse sent as a message of hope by Sugrīva to Sītā through the monkeys that go in search of her. It is not easy to decide how Yaśovarman dealt with the actual carrying away of Sītā. It could not have been part of the second Act itself. If we are to make it the action of the main Act (IInd), we will have to relegate the discussion and decision of Rāvaṇa to abduct Sītā to a Viṣkambhaka but the dialogue, even the part available to us, is too long for a Viṣkambhaka. Did Yaśovarman leave off the abduction of Sītā to be reported in a prelude to Act III? That appears to be the case.

(9) Act III. Rāma is separated from Sītā. He has killed Vālin and established Sugrīva on the throne of Kiṣkindhā. Sugrīva sends out the monkeys to search for Sītā. As an ally and friend of Rāma, he sends a message of hope to Sītā. Both Abhinavagupta and Bhoja quote this message of Sugrīva:

यथा रामाभ्युदये तृतीयेऽङ्के सीतां प्रति सुग्रीवस्य संदेशोक्तिः –

बहुनात्र किमुक्तेन पारेऽपि जलधेस्स्थिताम् ।
अचिरादेव देवि त्वाम् आहरिष्यति राघवः ॥

— Abhi. Bhā. Vol. II. p. 504 : GOS. edn. III. p. 20

Bhoja illustrates with this situation the second Patākāsthāna:

वचस्सातिशयश्लिष्टं काव्यबन्धसमाश्रयम् ।
पताकास्थानकमिदं द्वितीयं परिकीर्तितम् ॥

यथा रामाभ्युदये तृतीयेऽङ्के सुग्रीवः सन्दिशति--

बहुनात्र किमुक्तेन पारेऽपि जलधेस्स्थिताम् ।
अचिरादेव देवि त्वाम् आहरिष्यति राघवः ॥

अत्र जलधेः पारस्य दुर्गत्वात् दुष्करं प्रश्वासं मन्यमानः रामपराक्रमस्य तत्र अप्रतिघातात् अतिशयमुपवर्णयन् चिन्त्यमानेषु देशान्तरेषु सुकरतां प्रश्वासने भाविनीं ख्यापयति, न तु जलधेः पारे स्थितां ज्ञात्वैव ।

— Sṛ. Pra. Vol. II. p. 488

The ND. also quotes this on p. 45 as illustration of the same second Patākāsthāna with the comments

अत्र पारेऽपि जलधेरिति अतिशयोक्तिरपि सीतां प्रति तथैव वृत्तत्वात् प्रकृतसंबद्धा ।

but gives it wrongly as found in Act II.

(10) Act IV. There is only one extract from this Act available to us. The ND. says on pp. 91–92:

क्रोधहर्षादिसंभूतावेगगर्भितं वचनं तोटयति भिनत्ति हृदयमिति तोटकम् । यथा रामाभ्युदये चतुर्थेऽङ्के—

इन्द्रजित्— तात, किमिदमनुचितमारब्धं तातेन ? यदयमकाण्ड एव कुम्भकर्णः प्रतिबोध्यते । किमत्र न कश्चित् क्षुद्रतापसोपमर्दाय संभावितस्तातेन । अपि च—

रक्षोवीरा दृढोरःप्रतिफलनदलत्कालदण्डप्रचण्डा
दोर्दण्डाकाण्डकण्डूविषमनिकषणत्रासितक्ष्माधरेन्द्राः ।
याताः कामं न नाम स्मृतिपथमपथप्रस्थितेन्द्रानुसारी
स्वर्वासिश्लिष्टदृष्टः कथमहमपि ते विस्मृतो मेघनादः ॥

एतत् क्रोधादावेगवचनम् ।

Rāvaṇa has learnt that Rāma had crossed the sea and camped outside the City for war. Rāvaṇa is waking up Kumbhakarṇa for his assistance and Indrajit, Rāvaṇa's son, boasts of his own prowess and asks his father why Kumbhakarṇa should be disturbed when he himself was available.

(11) Act V. The war is in progress. Rāvaṇa produces by his black magic a severed head of Sītā before Rāma. Rāma swoons and weeps. There are two references bearing on this situation. The Abhi. Bhā. refers to the peculiar make-up, a stage-property, Citra-nepathya, contrived for the Māyā-Sītā's head:

यथा मायाशिरो निक्षिप्ते (?) रामाभ्युदये सचित्रं नेपथ्यम् ।
Abhi. Bhā. Vol. III. P. 13. GOS. edn. Vol III. p. 104.

The ND. also says on P. 158 मायाशिरोदर्शनं रामाभ्युदये ।

The ND. gives the following verse which Rāma speaks in this situation: (pp. 56–7)

तत्र व्यसनात् विघ्नो यथा रामाभ्युदये पञ्चमेऽङ्के रामः —

प्रत्याख्यानरुषः कृतं समुचितं क्रूरेण ते रक्षसा
सोढं तच्च तथा त्वया कुलजनो धत्ते यथोच्चैः शिरः ।
व्यर्थं संप्रति बिभ्रता धनुरिदं त्वद्व्यापदः साक्षिणा
रामेण प्रियजीवितेन तु कृतं प्रेम्णः प्रिये नोचितम् ॥

अत्र रावणेन यन्मायारूपसीताव्यापादनं तद्रूपेण व्यसनेन सीताप्राप्तिविघ्नजो विमर्शः ॥

The Dhva. Ā. quotes the last line of the above verse on p. 124 and the Locana, the other three lines.

In the NLRK. ll. 783–790, Sāgaranandin, while illustrating the same Vimarśa-sandhi, refers to a totally different use to which Rāvaṇa puts a Māyā Sītā and cites the same as from the Rāmābhyudaya; but as he himself states below in lines 1300–2, the play from which this is cited is a different one called Rāghavābhyudaya.

(12) Act VI. The war comes to an end and Rāvaṇa has been killed. Sītā is publicly repudiated by Rāma, as the reference in the DRA. (found in the ND. also-Sītāparityāga, Avamānana and Calana) shows. Sītā then undergoes the fire-ordeal. Here the text is quoted by the ND. on p. 109.

विस्मयस्थायिभावात्मकस्य अद्भुतरसस्य प्राप्तिरुपगूहनम् । यथा **रामाभ्युदये** रामेण प्रत्याख्याता सीता ज्वलनं प्रविष्टा । तदनन्तरं नेपथ्ये कलकलः —

धूमव्रातं वितानीकृतमुपरिशिखादोर्भिरभ्रंलिहाग्रैः
बिभ्रद् भ्राजिष्णु रत्नं ततमुरसि तथा चर्म चामूरवं च ।
भूयस्तेजःप्रतानैः विरहमलिनतां क्षालयन्नंकभाजो
देव्यास्सप्तार्चिराविर्भवति विफलयन् वाञ्छितान्यन्तकस्य ॥

ततः प्रविशति पटाक्षेपेण सीतामादाय वह्निः । सर्वे दृष्ट्वा ससंभ्रममुत्थाय— 'आश्चर्यमाश्चर्यं नमो भगवते हुताशनाय' इति प्रणमन्ति । अत्र अग्निप्रविष्टसीताप्रत्युज्जीवनात् अद्भुतप्राप्तिः ।

It has already been seen that Śāradātanaya gives the Nirvahaṇa of the drama as the starting of Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa with their followers for the coronation of Rāma.

(13) We have other stray verses also quoted from the Rāmābhyudaya.

स्निग्धश्यामलकान्तिलिप्तवियतो वेल्लद्बलाका घना
वाताः शीकरिणः पयोदसुहृदामानन्दकेकाः कलाः ।
कामं सन्तु दृढं कठोरहृदयो रामोऽस्मि सर्वं सहे
वैदेही तु कथं भविष्यति हहा हा देवि! धीरा भव ॥

quoted by Ānandavardhana on p. 61 of his work depicting Rāma's Viraha in the rainy season is to be located in Act II of the Rāmābhyudaya. It is prior to Sugrīva sending his monkeys in search of Sītā; Rāma is spending hard days on mount Mālyavān. First, there is the rainy season and then autumn. It is in autumn that the monkeys start on the search. From this same situation, we have two more verses depicting Rāma's Varṣākāla Viraha. One is a well-known verse:

यत्त्वन्नेत्रसमानकान्ति सलिले मग्नं तदिन्दीवरं
मेघैरन्तरितः प्रिये तव मुखच्छायानुकारी शशी ।
येऽपि त्वद्गमनानुसारिगतयः ते राजहंसा गताः
त्वत्सादृश्यविनोदमात्रमपि मे दैवेन न क्षम्यते ॥

Vallabhadeva ascribes this to Yaśovarman and so also Jalhaṇa in his Sūktimuktāvali. (Mad. Ms. P. 230 GOS. edn. p. 163.)

The other verse is :

आक्रन्दास्स्तनितैः विलोचनजलान्यश्रान्तधारांबुभिः
तद्विच्छेदभुवश्च शोकशिखिनः तुल्यास्तडिद्विभ्रमैः ।
अन्तर्मे दयितामुखं तव शशी, वृत्तिस्समैवावयोः
तत्किं मामनिशं सखे जलधर त्वं दग्धुमेवोद्यतः ॥

quoted on pp. 92–3 of the Dhva. Ā., and it is attributed to Yaśovarman by Jalhaṇa (Mad. Ms. p. 218. GOS. edn. p. 153). It is also part of the wailings of Rāma in the rainy season.

Dhva. Ā. III. p. 132 :—

तत्र शुद्धस्योदाहरणं यथा रामाभ्युदये -- "कृतककुपितैः"
इत्यादिश्लोकः ।

Locana : कृतककुपितैर्बाष्पाम्भोभिः सदैन्यविलोकितै-
र्वनमपि गता यस्य प्रीत्या धृतापि तथाम्बया ।
नवजलधरश्यामाः पश्यन् दिशो भवतीं विना
कठिनहृदयो जीवत्येव प्रिये स तव प्रियः ॥

The above is quoted by Ānandavardhana in Dhva. Ā. Ud. III. p. 132; while he quotes only the bit कृतककुपितैः mentioning the Rāmābhyudaya by name, the whole verse is quoted at this place in the Locana; it is also quoted on pp. 604–5 of the S. K. Ā. of Bhoja; this verse too has to be located in Rāma's vilāpa in the rainy season in this drama.

Dhva. Ā. II. pp. 90–1 :

रक्तस्त्वं नवपल्लवैरहमपि श्लाघ्यैः प्रियाया गुणै-
स्त्वामायान्ति शिलीमुखाः स्मरधनुर्मुक्तास्तथा मामपि ।

कान्तापादतलाहितस्तव मुदे तद्वन्ममाप्यावयोः
सर्वं तुल्यमशोक! केवलमहं धात्रा सशोकः कृतः ॥

This is a very well known verse quoted by Ānandavardhana and numerous other writers. Hemacandra explains its context on p. 20 of his Kāvyānuśāsana:

सीतावियोगविसंष्ठुलावस्थस्य दाशरथेरियमुक्तिः ।

and Vallabhadeva and Kṣemendra (in his Suvṛttatilaka) ascribe it to Yaśovarman. This verse is also from the Rāma-vilāpa in the Rāmābhyudaya, but relates to the spring season; i. e., this should be placed before Rāma meeting Sugrīva; it is when Rāma is on the Pampā-banks that the spring is on. Yaśovarman's verse रक्तस्त्वं etc., in which Rāma addresses an Aśoka is inspired by the following verse in the same mood of Rāma in Vālmīki:

अशोक शोकापनुद शोकोपहतचेतसाम् ।
त्वन्नामानं कुरु क्षिप्रं प्रियासन्दर्शनेन माम् ॥

Araṇya Kāṇḍa 60. 17.

Jalhaṇa gives some more verses of Yaśovarman which are evidently from the Rāmābhyudaya. Jalhaṇa gives over the name of Yaśovarman:

प्रारब्धां तरुपुत्रकेषु सहसा सन्त्यज्य सेकक्रियां
एतास्तापसकन्यकाः किमिदमित्यालोकयन्त्याकुलाः ।
आरोहन्त्युटजद्रुमांश्च वटवो वाचंयमास्सत्वरं
सद्योमुक्तसमाधयो निज(बृसी)ष्वेवोच्चपादं स्थिताः ॥

This verse describes the commotion created in the peaceful hermitagas either by Sūrpaṇakhā or by the

arrival of Rāvana in his Puṣpaka or by the latter's departure in Puṣpaka with the crying Sitā. The verse is anonymously quoted on p. 110 of the Avaloka.

Sūktimuktāvali, Mad. Ms. p. 490, GOS. edn. p. 727 :—

> प्रौढच्छेदानुरूपोच्चलनरयभवत्सैंहिकेयोपघात-
> त्रासाकृष्टाश्वतिर्यग्वलितरविरथेनारुणेनेक्ष्यमाणम् ।
> कुर्वत्काकुत्स्थवीर्यश्रुतिमिव मरुतां कन्धरारन्ध्रभाजां
> भाङ्कारैर्भीममेतत् निपतति वियतः कुम्भकर्णोत्तमाङ्गम् ॥

The Śārṅgadharapaddhati also ascribes this verse to Yaśovarman. It has to be located in Act V probably. It describes the fall of Kumbhakarṇa in the fight and is perhaps spoken by two Vidyādharas or some such persons above who are witnesses to the fight and who make the audience aware of the fight that is taken as fought off the stage. For this is the way the fights are dealt with in Sanskrit plays.

Sūktimuktāvali, Mad. Ms. P. 584, GOS. edn. p. 507 :—

> सुलभाः पुरुषा राजन् सततं प्रियवादिनः ।
> अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य वक्ता श्रोता च दुर्लभः ॥

This verse is Vālmiki's and is found as the words of Vibhīṣaṇa who advises Rāvaṇa. Yaśovarman borrows it and puts it in the mouth of Mārīca in Act II, or of Vibhīṣaṇa or Kumbhakarṇa in Act IV.

The Suvṛttatilaka of Kṣemendra enlightens us more on the contents of Act IV. This Act has in its early parts the embassy of Aṅgada from Rāma to

Rāvaṇa. The Suvṛttatilaka quotes as a verse of Yaśovarman the following :—

स यस्य दशकन्धरं कृतवतोऽपि कक्षान्तरे
गतः स्फुटमवन्ध्यतामधिपयोधि सान्ध्यो विधिः ।
तदात्मज इहाङ्गदः प्रहित एष सौमित्रिणा
क स क स दशाननो ननु निवेद्यतां राक्षसाः ॥[1]

The following attributed to Yaśovarman in the Kavīndravacana-samuccaya (Bib. Ind. Edn. Śl. 454; Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, HOS. Śl. 742) is likely to be a verse of Rāvaṇa addressed to Sītā ; it may be in Act V, though the last line makes this somewhat doubtful.

उच्छूनारुणमश्रुनिर्गमवशात् चक्षुर्गतं[a] मन्थरं
सोष्मश्वासकदर्थिताधररुचिः, व्यस्ताल(लि)का[b] भ्रू(लता)[c] ।
आपाण्डुः करपल्लवे च निभृतं शेते कपोलस्थली
मुग्धे कस्य तपःफलं परिणतं, यस्मै तवेयं दशा ॥

(HOS. readings :— (a) मनाङ् (b) -लका (c) भ्रूभुवः).

The Sūktimuktāvali (p. 200, GOS.) gives another verse over the name Rājaputra Yaśovarman and Dr. Keith takes it as our Yaśovarman's verse (P. 222 Skr. Drama).[2]

कामस्यापि शराहतिः[3] न गणिता त्वं जीवनं संस्मृता[4]
नो दग्धो विरहानलेन झटिति त्वत्संगमाशामृतेः[5] ।

1. Māṇikyacandra quotes this verse anonymously.

2. Keith quotes it from Śārṅgadharapaddhati (Śl. 1634) but wrongly refers us to Subhāṣitāvali. The Śārṅgadharapaddhati has the following readings :

3. कामव्याधशराहतिः ।

4. सञ्जीवनी त्वं स्मृता ।

5. संगमाशामृतैः ।

नीतोऽयं दिवसो विचित्रलिखितैः संकल्परूपैर्मया

किन्वान्यन्मनासि स्थितासि(स्ति)भवती... [6]स्वयं साक्षिणी ॥

This verse with Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra is not definite enough to enable us to place it in the Rāmābhyudaya. Yaśovarman might have written other works or Muktakas on various aspects of love.

Kṣemendra quotes an Āryā उत्पत्तिर्भण्डकुले etc., in his Aucityavicāracarcā and ascribes it to Yaśovarman. Though he commends that the idea in the verse is Nirveda born of दैवार्पितप्रियाविप्रयोग it is not from the Rāmābhyudaya and is not a verse of Rāma. It is said in a footnote that another Ms. gives this verse as Śrīharṣa's.

While the number of the extracts shows the popularity of the play, the extracts themselves speak of the excellence of the style and the delineation of emotions in Yaśovarman's work. Even as the treatment of the story is free from strained ingenuities, the diction is simple, elegant and full of Rasa. Not only does Ānandavardhana resort to it for illustration of Dhvani and Rasadhvani, but even where he quotes a bit, Abhinavagupta quotes the whole verse, bearing witness to the vogue of the play among Sahṛdayas. Quoting the verse 'कृतककुपितैः' for Śuddha Asaṁlakṣyakrama dhvani, Ānandavardhana makes the following observation which forms an appropriate tribute to Yaśovarman's art :—

एतद्धि वाक्यं परस्परानुरागं परिपोषप्राप्तं प्रदर्शयत् सर्वत एव परं रसतत्त्वं प्रकाशयति ।

---

6. अस्ति ननु मे तव । All these readings are better.

4.

THE KṚTYĀ RĀVAṆA

Next to the *Rāmābhyudaya*, the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is, among the lost Rāma-plays, the most largely quoted in works of poetics and dramaturgy, the Abhi. Bhā., Śr. Pra., ND. and Bhā. Pra. As a contrast to the *Rāmābhyudaya*, the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, like the *Chalitarāma*, takes liberties with the original story and introduces changes there. The *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* emphasises, as its name signifies, the *Pratināyaka* Rāvaṇa, who resorts to all sorts of black magic. Consequently it is on the side of the *Pratināyaka*, an *Adbhuta* and *Raudra* dominated play, set in *Ārabhaṭī* throughout, and on the side of the hero Rāma, it is a *Karuṇa*–dominated play. From beginning to end, there is a series of situations portraying Rāma in deepest grief. This is but natural, since *Raudra* on one side results in *Karuṇa* on the other. Rāvaṇa first resorts to the *Māyā* of the golden deer, then Śūrpaṇakhā personates Gautamī and Sītā, and in the war, an extract shows that Sītā is made to commit suicide in fire on seeing the illusory chopping off of the head of Rāma. These series of perpetrations of witchcraft culminate in the greatest, in the raising of an all-destroying *Kṛtyā*, a female evil spirit, which perhaps Rāvaṇa intended to let upon the camp of Rāma stealthily at night. This however is not clear, though the name of the play "*Kṛtyā-rāvaṇa*" would take us in some such line of inference. Kuntaka[1]

---

1. *VJ.* De's edn. 1928, p. 243. See also *JOR. Madras*, II. 238–243.

cites the *Kṛtyā-rāvaṇa* as a play whose title is significant and refers to the essence of the play. *Kṛtyā* no doubt refers also to magic in general and need not necessitate the assumption of such a raising of an evil spirit, in addition to the other deceits of the golden deer, the false personations by Śūrpaṇakhā and the cutting off of a false Rāma's head. But one is not satisfied with these minor necromancies and an artistic imagination would wish to crown these acts in a greater act of *Abhicāra*, something like the performance of an evil sacrifice by Rāvaṇa himself to win the war, even as his own son Indrajit did at Nikumbhilā. This we are led to guess also from an extract from Act VI. of the play given in the ND. where Rāvaṇa is said to be in the Śāntigṛha, the place where he is performing the *Ābhicāra-yāga*. P. 88, ND:—

यथा कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के शान्तिगृहस्थे रावणे नेपथ्ये etc.

Thus, on the side of Rāvaṇa, the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is a full Ārabhaṭī play. Says the Abhi. Bhā.:—

मुद्राराक्षसस्य कैशिकीहीनस्य कृत्यारावणस्य च नाटकस्य दर्शनात् ।

—GOS. edn. Vol. II. p. 410

On the side of Rāma, it is one full of pathos, *Karuṇa Rasa,* with Rāma weeping at every step over his misfortunes. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra go to the extent of saying that the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is an instance of a play where there is too much of pathos which one is not able to bear. There is in it the *Rasa-doṣa* of *Punaḥ-punaḥ dīpti* of *Karuṇa.* Illustrating the

over-development of an *Aṅga-rasa*, *Karuṇa*, here (i.e., *Aṅga-augrya*), the ND. says:—

अथ अङ्ग-औग्रयं ... ... यथा कृत्यारावणे जटायुर्वध-लक्ष्मणशक्तिभेद-सीताविपत्तिश्रवणेषु रामस्य मुहुर्मुहुः करुणाधिक्यम् ।

The drama must really have been of absorbing interest and full of action. When we see the style of the dramatist, we can at once say that he has not indulged in rhetoric and verbosity and has concentrated on development of action. The style is consequently simple and straight. As for example in the following line:—

यस्तातेन निगृह्य बालक इव प्रक्षिप्य कक्षान्तरे

a verse which young Aṅgada contemptuously flings at the great Rāvaṇa. Usually, in dramas we find that Rāvaṇa breaks upon Sītā with flamboyant verses boasting his valour. How unlike Bhavabhūti, Murāri and Rājaśekhara is this simple verse with which Rāvaṇa points out to Sītā that they two make an equal and excellent couple:—

विदेहराजपुत्रि !

विक्रमेण मया लोकाः त्वया रूपेण निर्जिताः ।
सब्रह्मचारिणमतो भजमानं भजस्व माम् ॥

Again the poet's dislike for the flamboyant manner is seen in the following simple way in which he closes his play and pronounces the *Bharata-vākya*:—

राम :— तथापीदमस्तु —

यथायं मम संपूर्णः चिन्तितार्थो मनोरथः ।
एवमभ्यागतो रङ्गः सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यताम् ॥

अपि च

निरीतयः प्रजास्सन्तु सन्तस्सन्तु चिरायुषः ।
प्रथन्तां कवयः काव्यैः सम्यङ्नन्दन्तु मातरः ॥

As the various extracts from the play given below will show, every Act is full of action. And the dramatist himself seems to be conscious of this and to have consciously attempted at writing such a play, in utter dislike of a verbose drama, actionless and deteriorating into a mere *Śravya-kāvya* cut up into Acts and put up like a dialogue. For he makes the *Sūtradhāra* say in the prologue that he is so tired of the art that he would fain leave the wretched profession to others and take to the yellow robes of Sannyāsins. For drama has become *wordy* and *devoid of any significant action.* He says :—

सूत्रधारः— (निःश्वस्य) आर्ये! ननु ब्रवीमि —

वाक्प्रपञ्चैकसारेण निर्विशेषाल्पवृत्तिना ।
स्वामिनेव नटत्वेन निर्विण्णाः सर्वथा वयम् ॥

तद् गच्छतु भवती पुत्रं मित्रं वा कमपि पुरस्कृत्य क्रमागतामिमां कुजीविकाम् अनुवर्तयितुम्" । P. 149

There is one more reference bearing on criticism of this play. From Śāradātanaya we come to know of a dramaturgist named Subandhu who classifies *Nāṭaka*, the first type of play, into five kinds, *Pūrṇa*, *Praśānta*, *Bhāsvara*, *Lalita* and *Samagra*. Śāradātanaya tries to explain these terms with citations of examples but we are not satisfied with his explanations (Bhā. Pra. pp. 238–241). Unless we get the

original work of Subandhu, we are not going to understand these five varieties of drama fully. It must be said that the reference here in Śāradātanaya to the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* being a Nāṭaka of the type called *Pūrṇa* is obscure. If the citation of the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* as an example of the *Pūrṇa* variety is however not by Subandhu himself but only by Śāradātanaya, the reference is very much less valuable.

Regarding the date of the play, it is earlier than Śaṅkuka whose time is *C*. 840 A. D. This is said on the evidence of Abhi. Bhā. where Abhinavagupta says that Śaṅkuka illustrates Vidrava from the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*; pp. 523–4, Abhi. Bhā., Mad. Ms. Vol. II; P. 52 GOS. edn. Vol. III.

अन्ये तु शङ्काभयत्रासैः कृतो यः स विद्रव इति । तत्र च विशेष्यपदमन्वेष्यम् । समुदाय एव विशेष्य इति श्रीशङ्कुकः । उदाहरति च कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के । etc.

The Plot: The extent of the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* dramatised into the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is from Sītāpaharaṇa to Rāvaṇavadha. The drama opens with the exiled Rāma living in Pañcavaṭī with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa and closes with Sītā's first repudiation by Rāma himself, her fire ordeal, the appearance of God Fire and his testifying to Sītā's chastity. God Agni pronounces his blessing and Rāma utters the final prayer for universal peace and bliss in the form of the *Bharata-vākya*. In the earlier part of this same last Act, the seventh, Rāvaṇa is killed by Rāma.

The number of Acts: The *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* takes seven acts to dramatise the above story. The

following *Bharata-vākya* preceded by the closing elements of the play *(Kāvya-samhāra* and *Praśasti)* is given by the ND. P. 113:

काव्यसंहारः — यथा कृत्यारावणे रामस्य प्रिये हिते च महति कर्मणि कृतेऽप्यसन्तुष्यन् अग्निराह—

अग्निः— वत्स! उच्यताम्, किं ते भूयः प्रियमनुकरोमि ?

रामः— भगवन्! अतः परमपि प्रियमस्ति ?

ND. P. 114 :—

(प्रशस्तिः) यथा कृत्यारावणे—

तथापीदमस्तु —

यथायं मम संपूर्णः चिन्तितार्थो मनोरथः ।
एवमभ्यागतो रङ्गः सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यताम् ॥

अपि च—

निरीतयः प्रजाः सन्तु सन्तः सन्तु चिरायुषः ।
प्रथन्तां कवयः काव्यैः सम्यङ् नन्दन्तु मातरः ॥

That this forms the end of Act VII may also be made out. For, another extract in the ND. says that some third persons, most likely Vaimānikas, Vidyādharas etc., who had been seeing the great war from air, observe that Rāvaṇa, the great warrior, had fallen. And this is said to be the first part of Act VII.

यथा कृत्यारावणे सप्तमाङ्के पूर्वार्द्धे —

"कष्टं, भोः कष्टम्!—

रामेण प्रलयेनेव महासत्त्वेन लीलया।
पातितोऽयं दशशिराः शृङ्गवानिव पर्वतः ॥"

अत्र विरोधिनो रावणस्य विनाशनम् ।

After the fall of Rāvaṇa the only great event is Sitā's repudiation and the fire ordeal, the Fire God figuring in which closes also the play. This must form the latter part of the seventh Act. Hence, the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* is a play in seven Acts.

The Story, Act by Act.

Though we have settled where and in what part of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story the play begins, it yet remains to be investigated how the play actually begins, and with what particular incident, the dramatist opens. We have also to decide whether Act I has a *Viṣkambhaka* and what events are packed in the opening Act. Regarding the opening of the Act, we have also to decide how the curtain rises, *i. e.*, how the Prologue glides into the first Act. We shall start then with the Prologue itself, from which also we have fortunately an extract supplied by the ND. (pp. 149–50):

यथा कृत्याराावणस्य आमुखे —

सूत्रधारः— (निःश्वस्य) आर्ये! ननु ब्रवीमि —

वाक्प्रपञ्चैकसारेण निर्विशेषाल्पवृत्तिना ।
स्वामिनेव नटत्वेन निर्विण्णाः सर्वथा वयम् ॥

तद्गच्छतु भवती पुत्रं मित्रं वा कमपि पुरस्कृत्य क्रमागतामिमां कुजीविकां अनुवर्तयितुम् ।" ततः क्रमादाह —

परिग्रहोरुग्राहौघात् गृहसंसारसागरात् ।
बन्धुस्नेहमहावर्तादिदमुत्तीर्य गम्यते ॥

अत्र स्वजीविकां दारेषु निक्षिप्य परलोकहेतुकार्यकरणं स्वय-माश्रितम् ॥

Here the Sūtradhāra resigns his profession and takes to the path of a Sannyāsin. Now, prologues must be suggestive and should always refer to similar events in the coming play. Here, I think, the dramatist suggests a character coming in the play who is dissatisfied with his job, is disgusted with his kinsman and chooses the path of spiritual salvation. In Act I we are told that the golden deer comes, the golden deer which is Mārīca; and Śūrpaṇakhā appears as Gautamī and Sītā and soon Act II ushers in Rāvaṇa for the abduction of Sītā. It is a recognized dramatic principle that characters are to be hinted at before they are introduced. (नासूचितस्य पात्रस्य प्रवेशः). And before Act I opens at Pañcavāṭī with Rāma's hunt after the golden deer, Māya–Sītā's abuse of Lakṣmaṇa etc., many things must have happened, *viz.* Śūrpaṇakhā's courting of Rāma and its consequence, Khara–Dūṣaṇa–vadha, the news reaching Rāvaṇa through the defaced Śūrpaṇakhā, Rāvaṇa going to seek the aid of Mārīca and the final settlement of the plans for abducting Sītā with the aid of the golden deer. Thus Act I must have had a prelude, a Viṣkambhaka which must have opened with Mārīca soliloquising. He had turned his steps in the path of salvation as a recluse after his bitter experience at Rāma's hands during Viśvāmitra's sacrifice. It is Mārīca's *Nirveda* and his life of a recluse that the Sūtradhāra's words refer to. The reference of the Sthāpaka–Sūtradhāra to a bad master is clearly intended to mean Mārīca's disgust

at Rāvaṇa forcing him to give assistance in his despicable act.

Act I must have opened with the golden deer frisking about in front of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā. That the golden deer figures in the drama is expressly said by Bhoja:—

माया यथा —

कृत्यारावणादिषु कनकमृगादिरचनात्मिका तु अमानुषी।

—P. 483, Vol. II. *Śr. Pra.*

The poet has taken great liberties with the original story here as already remarked. He has introduced Sūrpaṇakhā here who personates as Gautamī first and seems to take Sītā away to some distant corner and leaves her there. She at once takes the guise of Sītā and having heard of the cry for help from the direction of Rāma, swoons before Lakṣmaṇa, chides Lakṣmaṇa and sends him away for his brother's rescue. This the dramatist has done to save the character of Sītā who, in the original, unbecomingly suspects Lakṣmaṇa's character and pours unbearable abuse on his patient head. The following somewhat corrupt and obscure extract in the Abhi. Bhā. refers to this context.

"—अपलाप इति। यथा कृत्यारावणे गौतमीरूपच्छन्ना रामाक्रन्दितं लक्ष्मणे श्रावयितुकामा पूर्वमाह —

शूर्पणखा — अयि सुदते!

ततः सीता — अये किम्?

ततस्सा(शूर्पणखा) – (स्वगतं) सा अवस्तुते (?) सत्यं गौतमीम् एव मामियं जानात्विति एवं ह्याह–रणं मएणं कहं णिदं अपि सुदते ।(?)

—Mad. Ms. III. p. 48, GOS. edn. Vol. III. P. 176

Perhaps Śūrpaṇakhā in the guise of Gautamī has decoyed Sītā away from Lakṣmaṇa to a distant corner of the grove where suddenly the false cry for help from Rāma is heard. At once, the false Gautamī leaves Sītā there and purports to hasten to inform Lakṣmaṇa of it. On her way, she takes the form of Sītā and hurries to Lakṣmaṇa when the false alarm again breaks upon their ears. At once she begins to upbraid Lakṣmaṇa who is reluctant to leave that place. The dialogue between Lakṣmaṇa and the false Sītā is given by Bhoja and Rāmacandra. The Śṛ. Pra. quotes it in Vol. II. on p. 472. Rāmacandra's extract which is bigger is given here. ND. p. 136 :—

यथा कृत्यारावणे प्रथमेऽङ्के सीतावेषधारिण्या शूर्पणखया सह संवादे, नेपथ्ये — "हा भ्रातः! हा लक्ष्मण!, परित्रायस्व मां परित्रायस्व!" (इति श्रुत्वा शूर्पणखा मोहमुपागता। तस्यां च मूढायां) लक्ष्मणः — आर्ये! समाश्वसिहि।

शूर्पणखा — (अक्षिणी उन्मील्य सक्रोधं स क(ह)सा [सकरुणं] च) आः अणज्ज! अज्ज वि तुमं चिट्ठसि य्येव। अहो! दाणिंसि तुमं निसंसो निग्घिणो य। चिट्ठदु दाव भादुयसिणेहो कथं णाम इक्खाउकुलसंभवेण महाखत्तिएण भविय एवं तुए ववसियं? णं भणामि, एवमक्कंदंतो सत्तू वि न उवेक्खीयदि, किं पुण अज्जउत्तो।

(आः अनार्य! अद्यापि त्वं तिष्ठस्येव। अहो इदानीमसि नृशंसो निर्घृणश्च। तिष्ठतु तावत् भ्रातृस्नेहः कथं नाम इक्ष्वाकुकुलसंभवेन महाक्षत्रियेण भूत्वा एवं त्वया व्यवसितम्। ननु भणामि एवमाक्रन्दन् शत्रुरपि नोपेक्ष्यते, किं पुनरार्यपुत्रः।)

लक्ष्मणः — आर्ये! ननु त्वदर्थं एव आर्येण स्थापितोऽस्मि।

शूर्पणखा — कुमार! एवं मम अत्थो कदो होदि। एवं च अहं परिरक्खिदा होमि। ता सव्वधा अन्नंय्येव दे अणिट्ठं अभिप्पायं लक्खेमि" इत्यादि।

(कुमार!) एवं ममार्थः कृतो भवति। एवं चाहं परिरक्षिता भवामि। तत्सर्वथा अन्यमेव ते आनिष्टं अभिप्रायं लक्ष्यामि॥

It seems that with Lakṣmaṇa's departure the first Act closes.

Act II.

We are told by Rāmacandra that Rāvaṇa abducts Sītā in Act II, as the extract to be presently given will show. But before that, there seems to be a scene of Rāvaṇa coming to that place through air, for we find Bhoja illustrating *Mada* or pride by Rāvaṇa's pride, with a verse of his, from the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* while he is coming flying through the air. He is evidently coming to and descending in Rāma's hermitage. The following is the extract in the Śṛ. Pra. Vol. II. 487.

(मदः) रावणस्यापि नाटकेषु कविभिर्निबद्धः। यथा—कृत्यारावणे विमानस्थो रावणो मदादाह —

भीता (स्थ भोः) किममराः समराभिमानम्
उत्सृज्य तिष्ठति रिपौ; न हि मेऽस्ति वैरम्।

स्वस्थोऽरुण व्रज विकृष्टखलीनपाशः
प्रेष्येषु किं दशशिराः प्रहिणोति शस्त्रम् ॥

As he was coming along the skies, Rāvaṇa asks the alarmed gods not to be afraid and asks the Sun's charioteer to drive ahead in peace. Rāvaṇa then comes into the hermitage where Sītā alone is present and there are also some hermits nearby. The hermits and their chief, a Kulapati, seem to play some significant part in this drama rendering the help they could to Rāma. They are terrorised by Rāvaṇa but they try to save Sītā from him; Rāvaṇa first asks Sītā to prefer him and accept him as her new lord. He asks her to mount the Puṣpaka. She curses and abuses Rāvaṇa and when she is not willing to mount the Puṣpaka, Rāvaṇa threatens to chop off the heads of all the hermits. She takes pity on the hermits and prefers her own suffering to the slaughter of the hermits. The poet has undoubtedly worked in a unique idea here in making Sītā all the more noble by taking upon herself this vicarious suffering. The powerless hermits can do nothing but curse the evil Rāvaṇa. We shall first give here the extracts in the ND. presenting the dialogue between Rāvaṇa and Sītā. The first of them is clearly stated as extracted from Act II. The next closely follows and forms its continuation.

ND. P. 80:—

तथा कृत्यारावणे द्वितीयेऽङ्के—

रावणः — विदेहराजपुत्रि !

विक्रमेण मया लोकाः त्वया रूपेण निर्जिताः ।
समब्रह्मचारिणमतो भजमानं भजस्व माम् ॥

सीता — हताश! अप्पा दाव तुए न निज्जिदो, का गण्णा लोएसु।

(हताश! आत्मा तावत् त्वया न निर्जितः का गणना लोकेषु ॥[1])

Ibid. P. 81:

यथा कृत्यारावणे—

रा०— सीते! आरुह्यतां पुष्पकम्।

सीता—हतास! अवि मरिस्सं, न पुण आरुहिस्सं।

(हताश! अपि मरिष्यामि, न पुनः आरोक्ष्यामि।)

रा०— आः! किं बहुना —

यावत्करेण दृढपीडितमुष्टियन्त्रम्
उत्खाय चन्द्रकिरणद्युतिचन्द्रहासे (सम्)।
न त्वत्पुरो बद्धशिरःकमलोपहारः
आरभ्यते समधिरोह शिवाय तावत् ॥[2]

सीता – वरं अत्तणो सरीरस्य अच्चहिदं, न उण तपोधणाणं। इय अधिरुहामि मन्दभाइणी। हा आज्जपुत्त।

(वरं आत्मनः शरीरस्य अत्याहितम्, न पुनस्तपोधनानाम्। इयं अधिरोहामि। हा आर्यपुत्र! (इति रुदती आरोहं नाटयति।)

The Abhi. Bhā. has a part of the situation as illustration for *Utthāpana.*

---

1. Cf. *Rāmacarita* of Abhinanda, Aṅgada's words to Rāvaṇa:—

बहुश्रमः परजयः किमकारणमादृतः।
स चिन्त्यतामात्मजयो येन भूयो न खिद्यसे ॥ —XXVIII. 33

2. This verse is printed in the text as running prose matter with no metrical division of lines. Further, it is wrongly printed and read with the last word in the second line as 'Candrahāsena'. Perhaps the editor took it to be a *Viśeṣaṇa* to '*Kareṇa*'. Far from it. It is *Viśeṣya* to 'Dṛdhapiḍitamuṣṭiyantram' and '*Candrahāsena*' must be '*Candrahāsam*'. The final letter *Na* is a separate word and should come over to the third line of the verse.

तत्रैव (कृत्यारावणे) द्वितीयेऽङ्के—

"नेपथ्ये कलकलः" इत्यतःप्रभृति यावत्सीतां प्रति रावणस्य उक्तिः — "आ(:) लोकपालानां क्रन्दसि" इत्यादि। भाविनः वस्तुनः समुत्थापनादपि इदं तथोक्तम्। तत्रैव ऋषीणामुक्तिः "दुरात्मनेयं सीता स्वनाशाय ह्रियते ॥"

—Mad. Ms. Vol. III. P. 13. GOS. edn. Vol. III. pp. 104–5

The presence of eye-witnesses of Sītā's abduction by Rāvaṇa gives Rāma the information that Rāvaṇa has carried Sītā away. This is known by Rāma immediately in the play in this manner, though in the original Rāma knows it only after a time, and only partially, from Jaṭāyus.

Act III.

This Act contains the return of Rāma from the hunt, the astounding discovery of Sītā's loss and his meeting the hermits who narrate to him the incidents. Meanwhile Jaṭāyus has waylaid Rāvaṇa and given him heroic battle but has been thrown down half-slain by the demon. The hermits discover Jaṭāyus fallen down and it must be their chief, the Kulapati, who extols this service done by Jaṭāyus–*Paropakāra*. Abhinavagupta gives the Kulapati also as a *Prakarī* in the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*.

P. 499. Vol. II. Abhi. Bhā. (GOS. edn. III. p. 15):—

यतश्च परार्थमेव केवलं सर्वं अनुतिष्ठति सा प्रकरी। यथा कृत्यारावणे कुलपतिः।[1]

1. Reference is made to *Kulapatyaṅka* by Sāradātanaya and Sāgaranandin; that is the name of the corresponding Act in Māyurāja's *Udāttarāghava* and should not be confused with the situation in *Kṛtyārāvaṇa* discussed here.

It is in this Act that Rāma meets the dying Jaṭāyus that had performed heroic deeds and Rāma pitiably mourns over his death. The ND. has two references to this particular situation. Once it says that Jaṭāyurvadha is one of the many places where great grief is shown by Rāma.

यथा कृत्यारावणे जटायुर्वध-लक्ष्मणशक्तिभेद-सीताविपत्तिश्रवणेषु रामस्य मुहुः करुणाधिक्यम् ।

(P. 174 ND. extract above given). The other reference is a quotation of Rāma's verse on seeing the huge fallen body of Jaṭāyus from a distance, his surmises as he approaches it as to what it could be and his slow discovery that he is his father's dear friend Jaṭāyus. ND. P. 83:—

यथा कृत्यारावणे – रामो जटायुषम् अप्रत्यभिजानन्नाह –

गिरिरयममरेन्द्रेणाद्य निर्लूनपक्षः
    कृतरिपुरसुरेशैः शातितो वैनतेयः ।
अपरमिह मनो मे यः पितुः प्राणभूतः
    किमुत बत स एष व्यते (पे ? ती) [प्रोषि] तायुर्जटायुः ॥

Acts IV & V.

These two Acts must have covered the story upto the war. We have an extract from Act VI in which Aṅgada is seen in Laṅkā as a messenger sent by Rāma to meet Rāvaṇa. Within these two Acts, Rāma must have crossed the distance to Kiṣkindhā, made friends with Sugrīva and killed Vālin. Sugrīva must have sent monkeys to search for Sītā, for though Rāvaṇa has been known as the abductor, no one knew the place where he might have kept her.

We have two extracts from the ND. giving us Lakṣmaṇa in his sorrowful mood anxious for a speedy turn in the fortunes of Rāma. The second extract seems to be from the earlier part of this context. It illustrates *Kheda* by the fatigue in Lakṣmaṇa's mind (ND. p. 97) :—

तथा **कृत्यारावणे** लक्ष्मणः –

मार्गाः कण्टकिनः प्रतप्तसिकताः पांसूत्करा लङ्घिताः
क्रान्ताः शृङ्गवतां निकामपरुषाः स्थूलोपला भूमयः ।
भ्रान्तं दृप्तमृगेन्द्रनाथजनितत्रासैः समं दन्तिभिः
पीतं च द्विपदानराजिकलुषव्यासङ्गि तिक्तं पयः ॥

That this Act is appropriately called the *Aṭavyaṅka* and that Rāma's *Vipralambha* is portrayed here, are both known from a citation and gloss in Sāgaranandin's NLRK (11 . 3097–3100).

शोकसमुत्थमापदि परिदेवनं विलापः । यथा **कृत्यारावणे अटव्यङ्के** —

वैदेहि देहि कुपिते दयितस्य वाचम्
इत्थं गतस्य सहसा गतसङ्गमस्य । इत्यादि

Then in ND. on p. 85 :—

तथा **कृत्यारावणे चतुर्थेऽङ्के** सीतापहरणभ्रातृदुःखाच्च दुःखितो विफलान्वेषणो लक्ष्मणः—"तत् अपि नामायम् असद्वृत्तान्तस्य प्रतिक्षणमुपचीयमाननायकव्यसनभाजोऽभ्युदयावसानः संहारो नाटकस्येव भवेत् ।" अत्र अभ्युदयात्मकः उत्सवः लक्ष्मणेन अर्थितः ।

Perhaps these words open Act IV and at once Hanumān meets them on behalf of Sugrīva.

6.

Sugrīva's alliance is the *Patākā* in the Rāmāyaṇa story. Therefore, it can be surmised that it is in this part of the drama that the following extract given in the Abhi. Bhā. is to be located. Abhinavagupta gives it as an illustration for *Patākā* and it is likely that it is a verse spoken by Sugrīva himself. It expatiates on the virtue of service to others.

यथा कृत्यारावणे —

धन्यास्त (ते) कृतिनः श्लाघ्या तेषां च जन्मनो वृत्तिः ।
यैरुज्झितात्मकार्यैः तेषामर्थाः प्रसाध्यन्ते ॥

— P. 501. Vol. II. Abhi. Bhā. GOS. Edn. III. p. 17

Act VI.

Rāma has reached the shores of Laṅkā and Aṅgada has been sent as messenger to Rāvaṇa. Rāvaṇa is said to be at that time in his Śāntigṛha. Perhaps he has come to realise his situation and is performing some Abhicāra-yajña to get the aid of some *Kṛtyā*. He at once hears a disturbing alarm, seeking help.

Aṅgada has chosen a way to set about his business. He goes into the harem, seizes and teases Rāvaṇa's queen Maṇḍodarī. The ND. extract on p. 96 gives the verse in which Aṅgada teases Maṇḍodarī. This novel idea is adopted by later popular versions of the epic like the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*.

यथा कृत्यारावणे मन्दोदरीं प्रति अङ्गदः —

मा गास्तिष्ठ पुनर्व्रज क्षणमितो गत्वा पुनः स्थीयतां
यत्रास्ते भुजवीर्यदर्पितमदो विद्रावणो रावणः ।

मद्बाहुद्वयपञ्जरान्तरगता मूढे किमाक्रन्दसि
सिंहस्याङ्कमुपागतामिव मृगीं कस्त्वां परित्रास्यते ॥

That Aṅgada seizes her by hair is stated by Sāgaranandin who mentions this as an example of the element of *Āskanda* in *Ārabhaṭī vṛtti*, NLRK. ll. 1353–4:

आस्कन्दः ... ... अङ्गदेन मन्दोदरीकेशाकर्षणम् ।

Maṇḍodarī cries for help to her lord Rāvaṇa, and the cry reaches Rāvaṇa's ears. The Pratīhārī learns that it is Maṇḍodarī herself that is crying for help and informs Rāvaṇa that there is a commotion in the harem. Rāvaṇa asks her to ascertain what it is due to. On p. 88 of the ND. we find *Drava* or *Śaṅkā* illustrated with this situation from the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*. This extract is helpful doubly. It is definitely said to form part of the VIth Act. द्रव or शंका—

यथा कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के शान्तिगृहस्थे रावणे नेपथ्ये—" हा अज्जउत्त ! परित्तायाहि परित्तायाहि !

[हा आर्यपुत्र ! परित्रायस्व ! परित्रायस्व !]

प्रतीहारी – (श्रुत्वा ससंभ्रममात्मगतम्) अम्मो भट्टिणि वि अक्कन्दि ! (प्रकाशम्) भट्टा ! अन्तेउरे महंतो कलयलो सुणीयदि ।

[अंहो भट्टिनी अपि आक्रन्दति ! (प्रकाशम्) भर्तः! अन्तःपुरे महान् कलकलः श्रूयते ।]

रावणः – ज्ञायतां किमेतत् ? " इति

अत्र रावणस्य शङ्का ।

The Pratīhārī goes and comes back with the news that a monkey is teasing the Queen. Rāvaṇa at once rushes to her succour. There Aṅgada meets him as Rāma's messenger and an exchange of words ensues. Young Aṅgada performs his duty in a masterly manner and the scorn with which he refers to Rāvaṇa and touches upon the disgraces which Rāvaṇa had previously experienced are admirable. There is an ease and flow in the verse here. The whole situation is varied and shot with emotion, Maṇḍodarī in fright, Aṅgada in play, laughing and loathing Rāvaṇa, and Rāvaṇa with love for Maṇḍodarī on the one hand and on the other, with burning anger for the small monkey. The ND. (p. 158) refers to this situation on p. 158.

विचित्रभावं कार्यान्तरं कृत्यारावणे। तथाहि–अङ्गदेन अभिद्रूयमाणायाः मन्दोदर्या भयम्, अङ्गदस्य उत्साहः, अस्यैव रावणदर्शनेन "एतेनापि सुरा जिताः" इत्यादि वदतो हासः, "यस्तातेन निगृह्य बालक इव प्रक्षिप्य कक्षान्तरे" इति च जल्पतो जुगुप्साविस्मयहासाः; रावणस्य रतिक्रोधौ।

It is to this scene of great agitation that the SD. refers to as an illustration of the *Avapātana*, an *aṅga* of the *Ārabhaṭī vṛtti* (p. 329, N. S. Press edn. 1922):—

प्रवेशत्रासनिष्क्रान्तिहर्षविद्रवसंभवम्।
अवपातनमित्युक्तम् ... ... ॥
यथा कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के–
'प्रविश्य खड्गहस्तः पुरुषः' इत्यतःप्रभृति निष्क्रमणपर्यन्तम्।

The above context is reviewed more fully by Abhinavagupta:—

–सोऽत्रपातः ... यथा कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के–

प्रविश्य खड्गहस्तः सम्प्रहारः पुरुष इत्यतःप्रभृति यावदसौ निष्क्रान्तः ।

—Abhi. Bhā. Vol. III. p. 13; GOS. edn. III. p. 104

–(वस्तूत्थापनम्) ... तत्रैव अङ्गदेनाभिद्रूयमाणाया मन्दोदर्या भयम्, अङ्गदस्योत्साहः, रावणं दृष्ट्वा तस्यैव हि "एतेनापि सुरा जिता" इत्यादि वदतो हासः, रावणस्यातिक्रोधः, (रतिक्रोधौ) "यस्तातेन निगृह्य बालक इव प्रक्षिप्य कक्षान्तरे" इति वदतोऽङ्गदस्य जुगुप्साहासविस्मयरसाः, 'विध्वंसनं नाटयति' इत्यत्र रावणस्य शोकः–इत्येवं विद्रवाश्रयं वस्तूत्थापनम् ।

Ibid. Ms. Vol. III. p. 13; GOS. edn. p. 104

This has to be read with the extract given previously. The ND. gives this illustration, following Abhinavagupta who quotes part of the extract given above as illustration for *Śaṅkā* or *Drava* on p. 523 Vol. II. of his Abhi. Bhā. and remarks that this forms part of the *Garbha-sandhi*. The actual war will form the *Avamarśa*, with the sure hope of success crossed now and then by obstacles and calamities like the swooning of Lakṣmaṇa on being hit by the *Śakti* and the weeping of Rāma on seeing Māyā-Sītā's head being chopped off before him. The final victory ending with Lord Agni's blessings and reunion of Sītā form the *Nirvahaṇa*. Discussing Vidrava, consisting of Śaṅkā, Bhaya and Trāsa, Abhinavagupta says:—

कृत्यारावणे षष्ठेऽङ्के गर्भसन्धौ नेपथ्ये – हा अय्यउत्त ! परित्ताअहि परित्ताअहि !–

प्रतीहारी — (श्रुत्वा) (आत्मगतम्) अंहो भट्टिणी विअ आक्खन्ददि। (प्रकाशम्) भवदा (भट्टा) अन्देउरो (रे) महन्दो कलकलो सुणीयदि।

राजा – ज्ञायतां किमेतदिति।

अत्र रावणस्य आशङ्का, प्रतीहार्याः त्रासभये।

— Abhi. Bhā. II. p. 523; GOS. edn. III. p. 52

This is the illustration which, Abhinavagupta says, Śaṅkuka gave.

This *Dautya* of Aṅgada must have been finished in the earlier part of Act VI whose latter part must have been taken up by the war of which two incidents are mentioned by the ND. on p. 174, *viz.*, Lakṣmaṇa-śakti-bheda and Sītā-vipatti-śravaṇa. Rāmacandra gives these two as instances of the depicting of too much grief:—

—अङ्ग-औग्र्यम् ... यथा कृत्यारावणे—जटायुर्वध-लक्ष्मण-शक्तिभेद-सीताविपत्तिश्रवणेषु रामस्य मुहुर्मुहुः करुणाधिक्यम्।

We happen to know a little more of the latter incident called Sītā-vipatti. A big extract from this part of Act VI is given on p. 101 of the ND. We are introduced to a demoness named Dāruṇikā whom Rāvaṇa has commissioned to put an end to Sītā's life. Even the demoness is shocked and she tells it to the good Trijaṭā who is a friend of Sītā. Dāruṇikā avoids the more dastardly act of murdering Sītā herself and adopts a method by which she can make Sītā herself commit suicide. Within sight of Sītā, an illusory murder of Rāma is staged through witchcraft by or at the suggestion of Dāruṇikā. Sītā, seeing her

beloved lord murdered, resolves to enter fire and end her life. It is the report of the suicide of Sītā in fire that is carried to Rāma and is referred to as the Sītā-vipatti-śravaṇa by the ND. The following is the passage:—

आज्ञा। युक्तायुक्तमविचार्य क्रोधाद्यदाज्ञापनम्। यथा कृत्यारावणे त्रिजटया दारुणिकाभिधाना राक्षसी पृष्टा—"दारुणिए! किं तुमं भणासि?

(दारुणिके किं त्वं भणसि?)

दारुणिका—अय्ये तियडे! अवि णाम अप्पडिहृता आणा मम शरीरे णिवडिस्सदि। ण उण ईदिसं अकज्जं करइस्सं।

[आर्ये त्रिजटे! अपि नाम अप्रतिहता आज्ञा मम शरीरे निपतिष्यति न पुनरीदृशम् अकार्यं करिष्ये।]

त्रिजटा— तहा वि तुमं दारुणिअ त्ति वुच्चासि (तथापि त्वं दारुणिकेत्युच्यसे।) (पुनः क्रमान्नेपथ्ये) हा तियडे! एसा दे पियसही सीदा भत्तुणो मायासिरदंसणुप्पत्ति(ण्ण)मरणनिच्छया अग्गिं पविसिउकामा।

[हा त्रिजटे! एषा ते प्रियसखी सीता भर्तुः मायाशिरोदर्शनोत्पत्ति(न्न)मरणनिश्चया अग्निं प्रवेष्टुकामा।]

त्रिजटा— हा हदम्हि! मन्दभाइणी मा दाणि दिव्वेण भत्तुणो आणा संपादीयदि।

[हा हतास्मि मन्दभागिनी, मा इदानीं दैवतेन भर्तुराज्ञा संपाद्यते।]

एतस्मात् अवसीयते सीताव्यापादनाय क्रोधात् रावणेन दारुणिकाया आज्ञा दत्तेति।

It is clear that this sixth Act is a considerably lengthy one.

Act VII, the last.

In the first part of this last Act, Rāvaṇa is slain. An extract in the ND. (p. 100) not only mentions the incident with the quotation of a verse but specifies also that the extract is from the first part of Act VII.

यथा कृत्यारावणे सप्तमाङ्कस्य पूर्वार्द्धे —

कष्टं भोः कष्टं !

रामेण प्रलयेनेव महासत्त्वेन लीलया ।
पातितोऽयं दशशिराः शृङ्गवानिव पर्वतः ॥

अत्र विरोधिनो रावणस्य विनाशनम् इति ।

There is no extract to show how the dramatist managed the coronation of Vibhīṣaṇa. As a matter of fact, there is no light on the interesting question of how this dramatist handled the character of Vibhīṣaṇa. The most poignant incident of the latter part of Act VII is Rāma's repudiation of Sītā and her fire ordeal. When she enters the fire, God Fire appears and assures Rāma of her chastity. The drama now comes to a close and we have two extracts from the very end of the play, which have already been given.

ND. p. 113 :—

काव्यसंहारः —यथा कृत्यारावणे सीतारक्षणे रामस्य प्रिये हिते च महति कर्मणि कृतेऽप्यसन्तुष्यन् अग्निराह —

'वत्स ! उच्यतां किं ते भूयः प्रियमनुकरोमि ?

रामः — भगवन् ! अतः परमपि प्रियमस्ति ?

ND. P. 114–5:

प्रशस्तिः— यथा कृत्यारावणे रामः –

तथापीदमस्तु –

यथायं मम संपूर्णः चिन्तितार्थो मनोरथः ।
एवमभ्यागतो रङ्गः सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यताम् ॥

अपि च –

निरीतयः प्रजाः सन्तु सन्तः सन्तु चिरायुषः ।
प्रथन्तां कवयः काव्यैः सम्यङ्नन्दन्तु मातरः ॥

THE CHALITA RĀMA

The earliest Ālaṁkārika from whom we know of a Rāmāyaṇa-play called *Chalitarāma* and get some glimpses of it is Dhanika, the author of the *Avaloka* on the *Daśarūpaka*. Dhanika quotes it thrice, on pp. 27, 83 and 85 (N. S. Press edn. 1897).

1. On p. 27, he quotes it to illustrate *bandha* or taking one captive:—

विद्रवो वधबन्धादिः । यथा **छलितरामे** —

येनावृत्य मुखानि साम पठतामत्यन्तमायासितं
बाल्ये येन हृताक्षसूत्रवलयप्रत्यर्पणैः क्रीडितम् ।
युष्माकं हृदयं स एष विशिखैरापूरितांसस्थलो
मूर्च्छाघोरतमःप्रवेशविवशो बद्ध्वा लवो नीयते ॥

This is also quoted in illustration of the same point by Rāmacandra in his ND. on p. 98. This extract shows that someone takes Lava captive. Evidently Lava takes possession of the Aśvamedha horse of Rāma, in Vālmiki's Āśrama, and a fight ensues in which Lava is taken captive. Unlike the *Uttararāmacarita* which brings on Lakṣmaṇa's son Candraketu to the fight, the *Chalitarāma*, as we shall see, brings Lakṣmaṇa himself.

2. On p. 83, of the *Avaloka*, in illustration of the *Vīthyaṅga Avagalita*, one of the methods on inducting the opening act of the play, Dhanika says:—

यथा छलितरामे —

रामः — लक्ष्मण! तातवियुक्तामयोध्यां विमानस्थो नाहं प्रवेष्टुं शक्नोमि। तदवतीर्य गच्छामि।

कोऽपि सिंहासनस्याधः स्थितः पादुकयोः पुरः।
जटावानक्षमाली च[1] चामरी च विराजते॥

इति भरतदर्शनकार्यसिद्धिः॥

This extract also is given in the ND. on p. 150, to illustrate the same point. From this we come to know of the arrival of Rāma in Puṣpaka in Ayodhyā after his victory over Rāvaṇa and Rāma's meeting with Bharata.

3. P. 85, in illustration of *Avasyandita*, a *Vīthyaṅga*, in which what has been revealed unawares in the stress of emotion is given a different turn in an effort to keep the secret.

यथा छलितरामे — (छाया) जात! कल्यं खलु युवाभ्यामयोध्यायां गन्तव्यम्। तर्हि स राजा विनयेन नमितव्यः।

लवः — अम्ब! किमावाभ्यां राजोपजीविभ्यां भवितव्यम्?

सीता — जात! स खलु युवयोः पिता?

लवः — किमावयो रघुपतिः पिता?

सीता — (साशङ्कम्) जात! न खलु परं युवयोः, सकलाया एव पृथिव्याः।

This is a conversation exiled Sītā has with son Lava who is to go to Rāma's court in Ayodhyā, with Kuśa.

---

1. ND. p. 150: variant अक्षवलयो।

This passage is quoted, for illustrating the same point, in the SD. also (p. 361, N. S. Press edn. 1922). Sītā tells Lava and Kuśa that Rāma is their father and they must bow to him on going to Ayodhyā, but suddenly realising that she had made an unguarded utterance, she glosses it over:–"Oh, father not of you two only, but of the entire world!"

The ND. takes us further. It has one more extract from the scene in Rāma's Aśvamedha-maṇḍapa, where a golden image of Sītā is established, to represent her. Lava sees it and identifies his mother in the image. It is from this that Rāma and others know that Sītā is alive. On p. 104, in illustration of *Nirodha*, i. e. *Kāryamīmāṁsā* an *aṅga* of the last *Sandhi*, the *Nirvahaṇa*, the ND. says:—

यथा **छलितरामे** - लक्ष्मणेन बद्ध्वा आनीतो लवः यज्ञार्थं सीताप्रतिकृतिम् उपकल्पितां रामसदसि दृष्ट्वा स्वगतमाह –

लवः — (स्वगतम्) अये! कथमियमम्बा राजद्वारमागता (उत्थाय सहसा उपगम्याञ्जलिं बध्वा) अम्ब! अभिवादये। (निरूप्य) कथमियं काञ्चनमयी! (उपसृत्योपविशति। सर्वे परस्परं अवलोकयन्ति।)

रामः — (दृष्ट्वा) वत्स, किमियं तव माता?

लवः — राजन्! ज्ञायते सैवेयमस्मज्जननी, किन्त्वेषा जननी भूषणोज्ज्वला।[1] (रामः सबाष्पं हस्तेन गृहीत्वा समीपे उपवेशयति।)

---

1. *Cf.* the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, the similar touching episode of child Rohasena and Vasantasenā, Act VI:—

दारकः – रदनिके! कैषा ... रदनिका - आर्या ते जननी भवति।

दारकः – अलीकं त्वं भणसि। यद्यस्माकमार्या जननी, तत् किमर्थमलङ्कृता।

लक्ष्मणः—(सास्त्रम्) आयुष्मन्! किंनामधेया सा देवानांप्रियस्य जननी?

लवः — तां खलु मातामहोऽस्माकमभिधत्ते सीतेति ।

लक्ष्मणः – (सबाष्पं रामस्य पाद्योर्निपत्य) आर्य! दिष्ट्या वर्धसे। सपुत्रा जीवत्यार्या ।

अत्र नष्टस्य सीताजीवनकार्यस्य युक्त्या मीमांसा इति ।

The Sr̥. Pra. (III. p. 536) mentions in illustration of the *Lakṣaṇa* called *Sārūpya*, that the above situation is in Act VI. of the *Chalitarāma*.

यथा छलितरामे – षष्ठेऽङ्के हिरण्मयीं सीताप्रतिकृतिमवलोक्य लवः सक्षोभसंभ्रमं 'कथमम्बा इहानीता ... ... ' ।

There is yet another useful extract from the *Chalitarāma* in the ND. (on p. 154). It gives a verse from the prologue which describes the season, *S'aradr̥tu*, and incidentally introduces the drama proper and the entry of the first character, or characters of Act I.

यथा छलितरामे —

आसादितप्रकटनिर्मलचन्द्रहासः
प्राप्तः शरत्समय एष विशुद्धकान्तः ।
उत्खाय गाढतमसं घनकालमुग्रं
रामो दशास्यमिव संभृतबन्धुजीवः ॥

This verse is anonymously quoted by Dhanika and Bhoja too. From this it is clear that the drama begins after the victory of Rāma over Rāvaṇa.

The Sr̥. Pra. has in chapter XI another reference to the peculiar turn which the dramatist has given

in this play, to the original story. Bhoja gives in that context a series of examples of dramatists freely altering the original to suit their purposes. One of the examples is from the *Chalitarāma*.

"लवणप्रयुक्तराक्षसाभ्यां रामोपह्वरे तत्तदभिधाय सीता परित्याजिता, न कैकेयीमन्थराभ्यामिति छलितरामे । —P. 410 Śr. Pra. Vol. II.

This passage is found in a very corrupt manner on p. 643 of the SKĀ.

Usually we have three kinds of Rāma-dramas. Some dramas begin with the proposed coronation and its dissolution and end with Rāma's Paṭṭābhiṣeka after the war, while some others begin in the Pañcavaṭī and end with the Paṭṭābhiṣeka. The third kind of Rāma-play is the pure Uttarakāṇḍa play like the *Uttararāmacarita* and the *Kundamālā*. To this third class belongs this *Chalitarāma*. It starts with Rāma in the air in *Puṣpaka*, entering the City of Ayodhyā after the victory over Rāvaṇa. He is anxious to meet Bharata. From the *Puṣpaka* he speaks to Lakṣmaṇa that it is improper to fly into the City and that they must walk into it. Suddenly he sees somebody like an ascetic, Bharata at Nandigrāma. Here begins the drama and to this very opening belongs the second *Avaloka*-extract and the third ND.-extract. After Bharata-samāgama and Paṭṭābhiṣeka, rises the task of putting down Lavaṇāsura to which duty Śatrughna is asked to attend. Sītā is now in pregnant state, and according to the story in the original she is banished by Rāma himself on hearing tormenting gossips in the City regarding her purity. But the *Chalitarāma* has not

attributed this vulgar gossip to the good citizens of Ayodhyā; for does not Vālmīki say of them :—

सर्वे नराश्च नार्यश्च धर्मशीलाः सुसंयताः ।
उदिताः शीलवृत्ताभ्यां महर्षय इवामलाः ॥ [1]

So the dramatist managed to make some use of Lavaṇa whom others have left with a mere allusion. Lavaṇa plots against Rāma, sends two Rākṣasas who are said to get into intimate touch with Rāma and poisons his mind regarding Sītā.

लवणप्रयुक्तराक्षसाभ्यां रामोपह्वरे तत्तदभिधाय सीता परित्याजिता ......छलितरामे । —Śṛ. Pra. P. 410 Vol. II.

Rāma is thus duped into doing the most unkind act towards Sītā. Perhaps he realises, when it is too late, that he has been duped. It is this pivotal incident, "the duped Rāma" that has given the play the title '*Chalita*'-*rāma*.

At this juncture, the NLRK. comes to our help. This work has two extracts from the Act called *Puṁsavana*, which is clearly the name of the opening Act of the *Chalitarāma* that we are discussing: Illustrating the *aṅga* of the *Pratimukha-sandhi* called *Vajra* or shocking utterance, Sāgaranandin quotes from the *Puṁsavana* words which are spoken by one of the demons in guise deputed by Lavaṇa. The demon incognito says:—"Being the son of a noble

1. If no citizen of Ayodhyā can have anything to say against Rāma, the question naturally arises as to how Mantharā behaved in the manner she did. The oldest South Indian commentator Uḍāli replies that she did not belong to Ayodhyā. Commenting on Vālmīki's text introducing her ज्ञातिदासी **यतो जाता**, Uḍāli says यतः कुतश्चिज्जाता, श्रीमत्यामयोध्यायां तादृश्यो न जायन्ते । See my paper 'Uḍāli's commentary on the Rāmāyaṇa, *Annals of Oriental Research*, University of Madras VI, ii.

father, how is it that Rāma has not yet abandoned Sītā whom Rāvaṇa had taken away and kept for such a long time".

(छाया) आर्यपुत्रस्य पुत्रो भूत्वा तावन्तं कालं रावणेनोपनीतां सीतामद्यापि न परित्यजति।

(NLRK., Lines 697–9). Whose guises did these two emissaries of Lavaṇa take? Here again the NLRK. helps us by saying that they took the guise of Kaikeyī and Mantharā and that their names were Sumāya and Citāmukha. The illustration in NLRK. is for the third variety of Kapaṭa or Deceit; lines 2820–1:

शेषोऽपि पुंसवनाङ्के सुमायचितामुखयोः कैकेयीमन्थरामायाचरणमिति। See also Bhā. Pra. p. 250 ll. 20, 21.

यथा पुंसवनाङ्केऽत्र चितामुखसुमाययोः।
कैकेयीमन्थरावेषधारणं कपटोऽन्तिमः॥

The poet thus presses into service the two characters responsible for the first exile of Rāma, and makes the demons impersonate these two characters known formerly for their anti-Rāma attitude. More noteworthy than this is that the poet works in the idea of the *Puṁsavana*–ceremony being celebrated for pregnant Sītā and it is on this crucial occasion that the two demon-agents of Lavaṇa start this explosive scandal about poor Sītā.

After abandoning Sītā, Rāma discovers his having been duped and there follows an Act of repentence, the *Anutāpāṅka*. There are two references to this Act in the NLRK. The second is a line of a verse showing Rāma's repentence, line 1824.

पश्चात्तापः ... यथानुतापाङ्के रामः —

'किं देव्या न विचुम्बितोऽसि बहुशो मिथ्याप्रसुप्तस्तया' इत्यादि ।

The first reference to *Anutāpa* (lines 974–6) is evidently from the *Praveśaka* of an Act in which the two emissaries of Lavaṇa, Citāmukha and Sumāya are conversing.

... तत्संवरणम् । यथानुतापे –

चितामुखः — केण सा गब्भदासी जीआविदा ।

सुमायः — महतीयं खलु कथा, पथि श्रोष्यासि ।

Sītā is abandoned and she is living in Vālmiki's hermitage. She gives birth to Kuśa and Lava who learn the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and Vālmiki proposes to visit the coming Aśvamedha of Rāma with the boys, to effect evidently a reunion of Rāma and Sītā through their children and through their recitation of the epic on Rāma. It is at this juncture that Sītā advises Lava that when they see Rāma they must bow to him, for he is their father. This is the situation in the third *Avaloka*–extract. Soon the Aśvamedha horse of Rāma comes roaming into the Āśrama which Lava and his friends catch; a fight ensues and Lakṣmaṇa takes Lava captive to Rāma's court. There Lava sees his mother in a gold image and Rāma comes to know through him that his beloved is still alive. And this occurs in Act VI of the drama. The mention of the Act is the useful information given by Bhoja. This must certainly be the climax and the last scene or Act or at least very near it. Five Acts have passed before that, and we know exactly the contents of only perhaps two initial Acts, Rāma's coronation and

banishment of Sītā. These two events might have taken place even in one Act; or the diplomacy of Lavaṇa, the damaging things said by his two spies to Rāma and subsequent banishment of Sītā might have been given in a *Viṣkambhaka* or *Praveśaka* in the beginning of Act II. We have no light regarding the contents of the Acts in the forest. When Rāma asks Lava the name of his mother, he says that his maternal grandfather calls her Sītā.

तां खलु मातामहोऽस्माकम् अभिधत्ते सीतेति ।

From this we see that as in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, Janaka and perhaps others like Arundhatī come to Vālmīki's Āśrama. Or perhaps, sage Vālmīki, who had played the father's role for Sītā, is referred to by Lava as his mother's father. The Lavaṇa-episode itself might have been utilised to yield greater dramatic machinery for the poet and he might have also lingered for sometime on the birth of the 'first poem'. From the Abhi. Bhā. which says

क्वचिन्नाटके धर्मः प्रधानं, यथा छलितरामे रामस्य अश्वमेध-यागः । —P. 39, *GOS.* I. Ch. I. 107

we have to take the Aśvamedha as the chief or crowning event of the play.

Surely, *Chalitarāma* has interesting turns of events. The verse 'येनावृत्य' shows the felicitous diction, the flow of thought and emotion of the poet. That the author could give the subtle touches with a masterly hand is seen in the two passages where he makes Lava exclaim to his mother who asks him to salute Rāma when he goes to his presence;—'What,

are we to become courtiers?' and later again where Rāma asks Lava who had seen his mother's golden statue "Is this your mother?" and Lava says in a most touching manner:—'Yes, but this mother here has brilliant ornaments!' In the *Chalitarāma* we have indeed lost another *Uttararāmacarita*.

THE JĀNAKĪRĀGHAVA

Extensive excerpts are to be had from another Rāmāyaṇa-play, the Jānakīrāghava which dramatises the main part of the story covering the carrying off of Sītā, the killing of Rāvaṇa, the recovery of Sītā and the coronation at Ayodhyā. There are as many as twentytwo occasions on which Sāgaranandin draws his illustrations from this play; from which we may be disposed to suggest that Sāgaranandin had some special relation to or interest in this play. There is also a citation from it in the SD. That the play is a Nāṭaka and that it is named after the leading characters Sītā and Rāma, the *pradhānas*, is known from the following extract (NLRK. ll. 384–5):—

प्रधानस्य (i.e. नायकस्य) निर्देशाद्वस्तुनिर्देशाद्वा नाटकादीनां नाम कर्तव्यम्। यथा जानकीराघवं नाम नाटकम्।

The main theme of the play, as mentioned above, is borne out by the following reference in Sāgaranandin which gives the beginning and the fruition of the action in the opening and closing Acts and junctures, Sandhis, of the play. (ll. 90–101).

फलयोगः— यथा जानकीराघवे प्रथमाङ्के।

सीता (सभयम्) अयि रामभद्र परित्रायस्व। हरति मां राक्षसाधमः।

प्रियंवदा — हला मा भैषीः। यद्यसौ त्वां हरिष्यति तदा वानर-चयपरिवृतः समुद्रकान्तारं विलङ्घ्य रामभद्र एनं राक्षसाधमं व्यापादयिष्यति, त्वां च प्रत्याहरिष्यति इति तर्कयामि।

इति मुखसन्धौ उदीर्णं यद्रावणव्यापादनं सीताप्रत्याहरणं तन्निर्वहणसन्धौ

'लङ्काधीशप्रभृतिरिपवो घातितास्ते च, साध्वी

लब्धा सीता ... ... ।'

इत्यादिना द्वयमपि साधितम् इति पूर्वोक्तस्याविरोधेन रावणस्य यो वधः सीतायाश्च प्रत्याहरणं स फलयोगः प्रतिपत्तव्य इति ।

The keeping of the main purpose in the mind of the audience at every stage of the action is one of the meanings of *Bindu;* to illustrate this, Sāgaranandin quotes the recapitulation of the main purpose at the final stage of success as found in the Jānakīrāghava. The extract completes the half-quoted verse from the closing part of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi, which was given above (NLRK. ll. 177–182):—

स च (i. e. बिन्दुः) कार्यस्य समाप्तिं यावत् प्रवर्तयितव्यः ।

यथा जानकीराघवे संहाराङ्के —

ताताज्ञायां स्थितमविकृतं केकयीप्रार्थितानां

लब्धस्तेषामवधिरटवीवाससंवत्सराणाम् ।

लङ्काधीशप्रभृतिरिपवो घातितास्ते च, सीता

साध्वी लब्धा किमधिकमतः प्रार्थये त्वां सुरेन्द्र ॥

Here we have a passage from almost the end of the play. We have luckily the opening benedictory verse of the play also in which, following the usual practise, the poet symbolically suggests the central theme of the play. Illustrating the seed or Bīja of the play indicated through a similar idea or chāyā—i.e. the fore-shadowing of the plot, Sāgaranandin says (ll. 148–152):—

छाया यथा जानकीराघवे —

नीतां दुर्गमगाधवारिधितलं दैत्येन हत्वा च तं
यः पृथ्वीं भुजगेन्द्रभोगभवनं (नात्) प्रत्यानयत्प्रेयसीम् ।
क्रीडाक्रोडतनुः स कैटभरिपुः पुष्णातु युष्मान्, जगत्-
स्वास्थ्यस्वस्त्ययनैकहेतुरमरैः सानन्दमभ्यर्चितः ॥

This may be the main opening benedictory verse, or a subsidiary verse of that nature which some of the later playwrights were in the habit of adding.

Having suggested the main theme in the benedictory verse itself, the poet mentions the theme more directly; illustrating Upakṣepa or introducing the theme in the opening juncture, Mukha-sandhi, Sāgaranandin says (ll. 563–7):—

जानकीराघवे प्रथमाङ्के —

रामस्य रावणकुलक्षयधूमकेतोः
प्रीतिं तनोत्यमृतसिन्धुरियं कथैव ।
वाचः कवेः सहृदयश्रुतिरत्नपारी(त्री)
पेया भवन्तु, न भवन्तु कृतं ग्रहेण (?) ॥

This would of course be just at the opening of first Act, soon after the end of the Prastāvanā. The verse resembles one at the opening of Veṇīsamhāra and must be the reaction of a character entering to a statement at the end of the Prastāvanā.

How does the action open in the very first Act of the play? The second extract given above showed that in the first Act Sītā and her friend Priyamvadā were talking, that Sītā was afraid that Rāvaṇa might

carry her off and apostrophied to Rāma to come to her rescue and that Priyamvadā assured her that if such a calamity should happen, Rāma would cross the forests and seas and bring her back. How could such an idea occur here? The explanation is that the poet has brought Rāvaṇa to the Svayamvara of Sītā. Sītā had already known of the arrival of Rāma on whom she had set her heart. The situation is not difficult for us to grasp for we have such changes introduced in the theme of the Rāmāyaṇa by playwrights like Bhavabhūti and Māyurāja, as also others whom we have already considered in these lectures. Among plays in print, we may remind ourselves in this connection of the Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara where Rāvaṇa is among the many royal suitors who had come to Mithilā. All this is expressly confirmed by a further extract from Act I, to illustrate Cūlikā, one of the devices of introducing a character or incident or an Act itself. In the opening Act, we have, as in the Śākuntala, the heroine and her friends; the poet develops here to some extent the pūrvānurāga-vipralambha between Rāma and Sītā. The stage is set for the Svayamvara and the test of bending Śiva's bow. When Sītā is passing through some anxious moments, she hears a voice from behind; it was Rāvaṇa, one of the suitors, who sweeps in, uttering forth his threat and resolve to the assembled Kṣatriyas that whoever might bend the bow or win Sītā's hand thereby, he, Rāvaṇa, is carrying her off to Laṅkā by force. The speech of Rāvaṇa is heard from behind the curtain and this is called Cūlikā (ll. 432–6):—

यथा जानकीराघवे प्रथमाङ्के रावणस्य पाठः (i. e. नेपथ्ये) –

रे क्षत्रियाः शृणुत रे दशकन्धरस्य
दोर्दर्पनिर्जितसुराधिपतेः प्रतिज्ञाम् ।
सीतां विवाहयतु कोऽपि धनुर्भनक्तु
नेष्याम्यहं पुनरिमामपहृत्य लङ्काम् ॥

Now we can understand the talk between Sītā and Priyamvadā and the former's fear and the latter's assurance. The dialogue follows immediately after these words of Rāvaṇa from behind the curtain.

ACT II. There are some extracts to enlighten us on the contents of Act II and the Pratimukha-sandhi of the play. To begin with the poet gives himself some scope for portraying love in its Sambhoga-aspect and we have really two fine verses on the love of the newly wedded Sītā, of that Sṛṅgāra which escapes from the veil of bashfulness through the side-long glances and the half-lifted half-titled face. Illustrating Vilāsa and Parisarpa of this juncture, Sāgaranandin says, ll. 651–6, 657–62 :—

यथा जानकीराघवे द्वितीयेऽङ्के रामः —

अपि भुजलतोत्क्षेपादस्याः कृतं परिरम्भणं
प्रियसहचरीक्रीडालापे श्रुता अपि सूक्तयः ।
नवपरिणयक्री(व्री)डावत्या मुखोन्नतियत्नतो-
ऽप्यलसवलिता तिर्यग्दृष्टिः करोति महोत्सवम् ॥

परिसर्पः यथा तत्रैव रामः —

मयि किल पुरा दृष्टे पश्चान्न दृष्टिपथं गते
सुतनुरनयन्मूर्च्छाम्भोधौ दिनानि बहून्यपि ।

भृशमधिगतस्थैर्या सेयं न मामभिभाषते
क्षिपति च मुहुर्व्याजाद् दृष्टिं सुधास्नपितामिव ॥

But it is all not smooth for love; the first disturbance is caused by the appearance of Paraśurāma who was coming against Rāma. Sitā speaks to her friend Priyamvadā with an agitated heart on learning of the enmity of Paraśurāma with Rāma but soon is relieved to hear from some one that her husband had vanquished his elder namesake. Illustrating the sudden development of an untoward thing, Virodha, and then the relieving news in the form of a welcome and pleasing utterance, Puṣpa, the NLRK. says (ll. 684–6 and 692–6):—

(विरोधः) यथा जानकीराघवे द्वितीयेऽङ्के —

हला प्रियंवदे एतेन सह समुत्पन्ने विरोधे किमार्यपुत्रे भविष्यतीति उत्ताम्यति मे हृदयम् ।

(तत्पुष्पम्)। यथा जानकीराघवे द्वितीयेऽङ्के –

मा भैषीः मिथिलाधिराजतनये! दिष्ट्याधुना वर्धसे,
भद्रं विद्धि निजप्रियस्य, भुजयोर्वीर्येण गुर्वोरपि।
आक्षेपे हसता, स्वपौरुषकथालापेष्ववज्ञावता
कर्षंश्चापमधिज्यकार्मुकभृता रामेण रामो जितः ॥

But a foreboding of the more serious calamity that is to befall Rāma and Sitā and of which Sitā had already had some idea in the Svayamvara itself, is given by the poet in the present Act also. Even as Rāma and Sitā are sporting, Rāma refers to an Aśoka tree which captivates Sitā with its fine foliage and blossoms, and in Rāma's words which have a double

meaning, the carrying off Sītā to Laṅkā is implied. In illustration of the need to bring to the fore the main purpose whose seed has already been sown in the first *sandhi*, Sāgaranandin says, ll. 642–4, (Bījodghāṭana) :—

जानकीराघवे यथा रामः सीतां प्रत्याह —

लङ्कासमृद्धिमापन्नः क्रीडारण्ये सपुष्पकः ।
कच्चिल्लोहितपत्रस्त्वामशोकोऽयं हरिष्यति ॥ इति ।

The same is cited again to illustrate the fourth variety of Patākāsthāna involving double meaning (ll. 1035-7).

There is one more extract from Act II whose exact place however we are not able to guess. Śatānanda, the priest of Janaka figures in it with Daśaratha. Nor does the point for which this serves as an illustration, the Sandhyaṅga Upanyāsa, throw any light on it (ll. 700–3) :—

उपन्यासः — यथा जानकीराघवे द्वितीयेऽङ्के-

शतानन्दः — इदं पुनरुपपत्तिमद्दशरथस्य वचनमुपश्रुत्य भृशमानन्दिताः स्मः । 'राज्यं भुक्तमशत्रुपौरुषकथा' इत्यादि ।

This refers probably to a speech of Daśaratha when he takes leave of Janaka and Śatānanda complimenting the King.

Act III. The three extracts available from Act III show that action has progressed rather fast; for in Act III we are told that not only has Rāvaṇa carried off Sītā but Sugrīva is already on the stage. It would appear that as Rāvaṇa had already been

brought on in the very opening scene and he had sworn to carry Sītā off, the poet had eliminated the Kaikeyī episode altogether; but frankly we are at a loss to know exactly how the poet managed to bring on the exile and forest life, and how within the space available for him before Act III, he even dealt with the destruction of Khara and his hordes which too is referred to as having taken place.

The two extracts available in the NLRK. from Act III of this play refer to Sugrīva reflecting on Rāvaṇa's unwise act and Hanumān mentioning Rāma's exploits and saying that it was natural that Sugrīva should seek such an ally. (ll. 713–5; 730–4) :—

बीजस्य यत्र उद्भेदः प्रकाशनम् । यथा जानकीराघवे तृतीयेऽङ्के

सुग्रीवः —

जानकीं हरता मन्ये दशकण्ठेन रक्षसा ।
विनाशायात्मनो वैरं रामे महदनुष्ठितम् ॥

तत्त्वार्थकथनं मार्गः । जानकीराघवे तृतीयेऽङ्के हनूमान् –

यस्ताडकां निहतवान् शिशुरेव, येन
भग्नं धनुः पशुपतेः, विजितो भृगुर्वा ।
एकः खरादिनिधनं विदधे प्रवीरः
तं राघवं शरणमेति हितं स्वमिच्छन् ॥

The third extract is in illustration of Anumāna, an aṅga of the same Garbha-sandhi, and is in continuation of the second one in the NLRK. (ll. 747–8). While the NLRK. quotes the later part of the verse, the SD. quotes the verse in full when illustrating the

same point (p. 312, N. S. Press, edn. 1922). As Sugrīva walks forth to meet Rāma, Rāma is able to see the heroic son of Sūrya in his very gait and look.

यथा जानकीराघवे नाटके रामः —

लीलागतैरपि तरङ्गयतो धरित्री-[1]
मालोकनैर्नमयतो जगतां शिरांसि ।
तस्यानुमापयति काञ्चनकान्तिगौर-
कायस्य सूर्यतनयत्वमधृष्यतां च ॥

The next juncture, the Vimarśasandhi, seems to be a long-drawn affair. There are three citations from it, in two of which the Act is called Māyālakṣaṇa, which is obviously a ms. error for Māyālakṣmaṇa, and in one of which the Act is mentioned as the VIth. From this VIth Act, there is a further extract without mention of the Sandhi. In the extracts with the definite mention of the Act as the VIth, Rāma has reached Lankā, but in the two extracts which only indicate the Sandhi as Vimarśa, the location is Lankā but Rāvaṇa is seen making approaches to Sītā. It is the latter that call the Act Māyālakṣmaṇa which would suggest that, as one of its innovations, this play uses the idea of a fake-Lakṣmaṇa; what dramatic purpose the poet achieves through an illusory Lakṣmaṇa in Rāvaṇa's efforts either to gain

1. *Cf.* Bhavabhūti, URC. VI. 19, Rāma's verse on seeing Kuśa which the present verse closely resembles :

दृष्टिस्तृणीकृतजगत्त्रयसत्त्वसारा
धीरोद्धता नमयतीव गतिर्धरित्रीम् ।

Sītā or to demoralise Rāma and his forces, we are not able to make out, as both the extracts from the Māyālakṣmaṇa-aṅka do not have direct bearing on this magic-expedient. In the first extract, illustrating Apavāda or exposing of one's defects, the wrongs committed by Rāvaṇa are enumerated and the warning pronounced that the terrible fruition of his evil acts is coming on. The speech is put in the mouth of Rāvaṇa himself but that might be due to ms. corruption. (ll. 801–6) :—

तत्र दोषप्रख्यापनमपवादः यथा **जानकीराघवे मायालक्ष (क्ष्म) ने (णे)** रावणः (रावणस्य ?)

अवज्ञानं स्त्रीति क्षितिधरसुतायाः कपिरसी-
त्यधिक्षेपो नन्दिन्यथ रघुपतेर्दारहरणम् ।
अमी दोषास्सर्वे ध्रुवमधिगतोत्पाककटवः
करिष्यन्ते घोरं व्यसनमधुना राक्षसपतेः ॥ इति ।

The other extract from this Act is given with the Act-name but without the play-name and it is Rāvaṇa's soliloquy about Sītā uttered in his mad infatuation for her. (ll. 1703–7)

यथा **मायालक्ष (क्ष्म) णाङ्के** रावणः —

साकु (कु) ष्टा कृशिमानमेति, मदनायासैर्वयं दुर्बलाः
सा पत्युर्विरहेण रोदिति, वयं तस्याः कृते साश्रवः ।
सा दुःखेऽस्ति धनैर्विना, वयममी तत्सङ्गमे दुःखिनः
सीतास्मासु तथाप्यहो न दयते तुल्यास्ववस्थास्वपि ॥

a Vipralambha-verse which strongly reminds us of three other well-known verses, one in the Amaru-

śataka, सा बाला वयमप्रगल्भमनसः etc., and the other two रक्तस्त्वं नवपल्लवैः and आक्रन्दाः स्तनितैः spoken by Rāma in the Rāmābhyudaya. If the Māyālakṣmaṇa-aṅka is then Act V, we have a gap of the whole of the fourth Act. In Act III, as we have seen, Sugrīva has approached Rāma for help; we have therefore the actual Vālivadha, perhaps Rāma's Vipralambha during the rains and autumn, then the despatch of monkeys for Sītā's search, Hanumān in Laṅkā, his return and the starting of the expedition; all these have to be dealt with by the playwright.

Act VI. Rāma has reached Laṅkā. There are three citations in the NLRK. from this Act. One of these is an address by Rāma to Rāvaṇa pointing out the unbecoming way in which the latter stole Sītā. This could not at this stage be what Rāma says directly to Rāvaṇa face to face with him in battle. This could be the message sent by Rāma to Rāvaṇa through Aṅgada the messenger. Illustration of the Lakṣaṇa called Guṇātipāta (ll. 1570–74):—

यथा जानकीराघवे षष्ठेऽङ्के रामः –

जातस्य द्रुहिणान्वयादधिगतज्ञेयस्य लोकत्रयी-
त्रासोत्पादिवपुर्धरस्य हरतः (भवतः ?) कोऽयं दशास्योचितः।
दूरस्थे मयि, लक्ष्मणे प्रचलिते कुत्रापि, शून्ये वने
वैदेहीहरणे प्ररूढकपटप्रौढक्रमो विक्रमः ॥

The two other extracts from this Act show Rāma in a dejected mood; in one we find him reflecting on Sītā's condition, her anxiety about news of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa which she seeks through Trijaṭā and the

outcome of every day of the battle which for her is a matter of life and death. Rāma says this to Lakṣmaṇa (ll. 32–7):—

श्रमः खेदः । यथा जानकीराघवे षष्ठेऽङ्के रामः –

इहैवास्ते सीता करकिसलयन्यस्तवदना
विचिन्वाना वार्तां तव मम च सार्धं त्रिजटया ।
विमर्दे रक्षोभिः प्रतिदिवसमाधि (वि)र्भवति नः
समुद्भ्रान्तप्राणा क्षिपति रजनीं वासरमपि ॥

By this time the major encounters of the great battle were over, only Rāvaṇa remained. Lakṣmaṇa comforts Rāma that as the more formidable youthful fighters Kumbhakarṇa, Indrajit and Kumbha have been destroyed, and there remained only old Rāvaṇa, Rāma should no longer worry himself. In illustration of Niyata-phala-prāpti or surety of success, Sāgaranandin states (ll. 84–88):—

अरातेरपचयपरम्परा नियता च फलप्राप्तिरित्यश्मकुट्टः । यथा जानकीराघवे षष्ठेऽङ्के लक्ष्मणः –

दूरप्रोन्नतकुम्भकर्णविटपी छिन्नस्त्वया, शक्रजित्-
स्थाणुः क्ष्मां गमितः, निकुञ्जगहनः कुम्भस्स चोन्मूलितः ।
पौलस्त्यैकजरद्रुमरिथतमनीकादुर्गेऽस्ति (?) ते
ध्वस्तेयं व्यसनाटवी किमधुनाप्यार्यो यदुत्ताम्यति ॥

That there should be a further Act is obvious; the Jānakīrāghava is therefore a Nāṭaka in seven Acts. The last Act is designated Saṁhāra, and mentioning this 'conclusive' name, Sāgaranandin makes three quotations from this last Act. The technical points illustrated by these quotations, also

prove that the play ends here. Rāvaṇa has been killed and Vibhīṣaṇa crowned. Recapitulating the connected purposes of the main undertaking which have been accomplished, (this is the second aṅga called Grathana of the final Sandhi, the Nirvahaṇa), Lakṣmaṇa tells Rāma (ll. 84–9) :—

यथा जानकीराघवे संहारे लक्ष्मणः —

ते राक्षसाः प्रणिहताः खरदूषणाद्याः
निर्विघ्नवृत्ति जनितं च तपो मुनीनाम् ।
शक्रस्य शल्यमयमस्तमितो दशास्यः
तस्य त्वयाद्य निहिता च विभीषणे श्रीः ॥

A similar recapituation of the purposes achieved is found in the extract cited in NLRK., ll. 177–82, mentioning the Act as the Saṁhāra. This has already been reproduced and explained. It is clear that this is the last verse of the play spoken by the hero in response to the customary enquiry at the close of the play, here made by Indra, 'किं ते भूयः प्रियमुपकरोमि' and before the very last utterance, the Bharata-vākya.

The author of the Jānakīrāghava did deal with the fire-ordeal of Sītā, but in what exact manner he handled this episode we cannot now say; that there was some original element in the way the poet dealt with it can be seen from the following extract bearing on it (ll. 886–8) :—

युक्तकार्यान्वेषणमनुयोगः । जानकीराघवे संहारे रामः — (सहर्षम्) वत्स विभीषण! आनन्दबाष्पाकुलितलोचनः त्वां न पश्यामि । सत्यं कथयसि न दग्धा जानकी ।

Vibhīṣaṇa brings here tidings to Rāma that Sītā has not been consumed by fire.

There is just one more point about the Jānakīrāghava which Sāgaranandin mentions; he says that for depiction of the nine conditions of love, the Madana-avasthās, we might see the portrayal of Sītā in the Jānakīrāghava (l. 2515):—

ज्ञेयं तु नाटके जानकीराघवे सीतानृत्ये ।

From this, as well as the extracts of love-verses we have seen, we might suppose that the author of the play devoted some attention to the lyrical side of the theme and treated it mainly as the story of the two exemplars of great love, Rāma and Sītā.

THE RĀGHAVĀBHYUDAYA

We know of a Rāmāyaṇa-play of this title from the SD. and the NLRK.[1] The former work has a single citation from the play and the latter has as many as fourteen citations from it, including the one found in the SD.

It is clear that the *Rāghavābhyudaya* is a Nāṭaka and that it deals with the central theme of the epic, Rāma's forest life, the loss of Sītā, the killing of Rāvaṇa and the recovery of Sītā. Sāgaranandin quotes Mātṛgupta's verses illustrating in a general manner the five Avasthās of the drama, *Prārambha*, *Prayatna*, *Prāptisambhava*, *Niyataphala-samprāpti* and *Phala-yoga*, with the episodes of the Rāmāyaṇa-theme, and for illustration from a specific play, says that these can be seen clearly in the *Rāghavābhyudaya*. (NLRK. ll. 102–9).

प्रारम्भो रावणवधे खरप्रभृतिवैशसम् ।
प्रयत्नः शूर्पणखया कृतः सीतापहारतः ॥

सुग्रीवस्य तु सख्येन सञ्जातः **प्राप्तिसम्भवः** ।
नियता फलसंप्राप्तिः कुम्भकर्णादिसंक्षये ॥

यो देवै राक्षसपतेः कार्यो दुष्टमतेर्वधः ।
फलयोगः स रामस्य धर्मकामार्थसिद्धये ॥

एतत्तु **राघवाभ्युदये** सुव्यक्तमेव ॥

---

1. This *Rāghavābhyudaya* dealt with here is to be distinguished from the play of that name quoted rather profusely in the ND. and mentioned there as the work of the author of ND. *(svopajña)*

We may take it that the play concerns itself with the story from the *Āraṇyakāṇḍa* onwards. The extracts that we have do not refer to any part of the earlier story of the epic. There is however one important point to be noted in this play, which Sāgaranandin specifically mentions; the poet uses the idea and character of Kaikeyī being at the root of all the further action. *Bindu*, the second of the five elements of the plot, *Artha-prakṛtis*, is usually defined and explained as the continuity or re-appearance of the main thread or seed of the plot. Sāgaranandin, who collects in his treatise the ideas in the different schools of the Nāṭyaśāstra, his work being called accordingly 'the gem-treasury of views of different dramaturgic texts', says that according to another view the *Bindu* is some persistent or obsessing idea or resolve which is given expression to by the hero or other characters in every act of the play. For example, he says, Kaikeyī is mentioned in every Act of the *Rāghavābhyudaya*. We may remind ourselves in this connection that in Vālmīki's original itself, whenever a serious mishap occurs in the forest life, Rāma or Lakṣmaṇa or Sītā exclaims:— सकामा भव कैकेयि and there is also the verse in which Rāma tells Kaikeyī on his return that but for her he would not have had an occasion to know all that he had known as a result of his forest life:—

तातस्नेहो भरतमहिमा पौरुषं वायुसूनोः
सख्यं चापि प्लवगपतिना कापि सौमित्रिभक्तिः ।
सीतासत्यं निजभुजबलं वैरिणां वैरिभावः
ज्ञातं सर्वं तव चरणयोरेष मातः प्रसादः ॥

Like other plays, the *Rāghavābhyudaya* has its innovations in the theme of the epic. To start with, there is a cryptic reference to a celestial voice, that of the Wind-God, to a curse which would last till the killing of Rāvaṇa. Illustrating the incident of an incorporeal voice–*Ākāśabhāṣita*–Sāgaranandin says:—

राघवाभ्युदये —

'अस्तु सौमित्रे पौलस्त्यवधावधिरयं शापः ।

लक्ष्मणः – कथं हरिपदसंचारी भगवान् मारुतो व्याहरति ।

That this curse is used as a crucial motif is sufficiently indicated because Sāgaranandin quotes this to illustrate *Ākāśabhāṣita* as an *Antara-sandhi.*

Into the situation on the eve of separation to be caused by Rāvaṇa's action, we have an insight in one of the quotations in the NLRK. There is a scene in which Rāma and Sītā are conversing; as they converse there is an unconscious reference to the impending calamity; such an unhappy reference is called *Gaṇḍa* or mishap which is one of the thirteen *Vīthyaṅgas*, and is illustrated by Sītā's reference to her '*Viraha*' from Rāma. (NLRK. ll. 3004–5).

यथा राघवाभ्युदये –

रामः –

किं ते स्यादिति चिन्तया मम मनः पर्याकुलं भ्राम्यति ।

सीता – 'विरहस्तव' ।

रामः – 'शान्तम्' ।

The abduction of Sītā had taken place and the only glimpse we have of the part of the play that follows immediately is a verse relating to Jaṭāyus preventing Rāvaṇa from having his way. The following is a verse spoken by Jaṭāyus flaring up and threatening Rāvaṇa, which Sāgaranandin quotes to illustrate the employment of the *Sāttvatī Vṛtti* in depicting *Raudra Rasa*. सैव रौद्रेऽपि।

राघवाभ्युदये – रावणं प्रति

जटायुः –

अवनिरविरथान्तः प्रस्थितैकैकचञ्चू-
पुटकुहरविलोलव्यालकल्पाग्रजिह्वः ।
अरुणरुचिरतिर्यग्वर्तिदृग्भैरवास्यः
कबलयतु भवन्तं क्रोधदीप्तो जटायुः ॥

The next set of extracts takes us to the seashore and the crossing over to Laṅkā. The Act which deals with this part of the story is called the *Setu-aṅka*, as the building of the causeway and the crossing over form the basic element of the Act. There is a reference to this in the SD., and inclusive of that reference, two in the NLRK. On reaching the sea-shore, as we see in the opening canto of the Yuddha kāṇḍa of Vālmīki's original, Rāma falls a prey to the pangs of love and begins to lament. Lakṣmaṇa, as he always does, reminds Rāma of the work ahead and the futility of wailing. Illustrating *Bodhana*, Sāgaranandin says :—

कार्यप्रतिवचनेन प्रतिबोधनं बोधनम्। राघवाभ्युदये लक्ष्मणः (to Rāma)—

तदेतद्विज्ञापयामि —

अभ्यर्थ्यतां मार्गमसौ पयोधिः
स बद्ध्यतां (वध्यतां) कूटमतिर्दशास्यः ।
विमुञ्च तावत्परिदेवितव्यं
कार्याणि सर्वत्र गुरूभवन्ति ॥

Another speech of Lakṣmaṇa in the same context referring to the request to the sea to give way, but not clear in its full import, is quoted by both Sāgaranandin and Viśvanātha:—

निवेदनं कार्यस्यावधारितस्य कथनम्, यथा **राघवाभ्युदये सेतवङ्के** —

लक्ष्मणः – "आर्य समुद्राभ्यर्थनया गन्तुमुद्यतोऽसि, तत्किमेतत्" ।

—NLRK. ll. 1795–60. SD. NS. Press edn. 1922, P. 350.

The most important of the original ideas introduced by the author of the *Rāghavābhyudaya* is a false peace-offer which Rāvaṇa makes to Rāma during an early stage of the war. This is featured in the penultimate juncture, the *Vimarśa-sandhi*, and Sāgaranandin has four references to it. Rāvaṇa employs a Rākṣasī named Jālinī, disguised as Sītā, and offers to surrender her to Rāma; Rāma, who, according to Vālmīki, declares that he would afford security even if Rāvaṇa himself would surrender (यदि वा रावणः स्वयम् VI. 18–35), is now faced in this drama with a situation which confuses him for a while. The dilemma for Rāma is whether to take back Sītā and accept Rāvaṇa as friend or to fulfil his promise to Vibhīṣaṇa that he would make the latter King of Laṅkā. Illustrating the form of *Sāttvatī Vṛtti* called

Saṅghātya which is the resorting to a treacherous manoeuvre, Sāgaranandin says (ll. 1300–2):—

राघवाभ्युदये रामं वञ्चयितुं रावणेन कूटसन्धौ जालिनी नाम राक्षसी सीता कृता ।

To illustrate the whole idea of *Vimarśa* or suspense and cogitation, Sāgaranandin cites the situation more fully in an earlier passage.

विलोभनकृतो यथा मायासीताप्यनेन (–र्पणेन) रामस्य राक्षसैः जनितः सन्देहः । रामाभ्युदये (राघवाभ्युदये) रावणेन आरब्ध-कूटसन्धौ जालिनीं राक्षसीं सीतारूपेण रामस्य दर्शयता रामस्य जनितो विमर्शः । यदाह (i. e., Rāma says here):—

कथमिव विदधामि तस्य सन्धिं
कथममरेन्द्रगिरां भवामि वासः (भवाम्यवाच्यः) ।
इति विषमविवर्तमानचिन्ता-
तरलमतिर्न विनिश्चिनोमि किञ्चित् ॥

Indra had evidently made his appearance in the scene and was persuading Rāma to take Sītā and accept Rāvaṇa as friend.

In a citation which continues the same context, we find Rāma appealing to Indra and saying that he could never go back on the word that he would crown Vibhīṣaṇa as King of Laṅkā. Some of the words and the construction are not clear. It would appear from a further quotation which will be cited presently that the Indra here is also a false impersonation and it was really Rāvaṇa who appeared in Indra's guise and induced Rāma to come

to terms with Rāvaṇa. Illustrating the quality of the hero called *Tejas* which is defined as the carrying out of a resolve that has been taken, Sāgaranandin says:

आरब्धादनिवर्तनं तेजः । यथा राघवाभ्युदये रामः –

आज्ञासु (आज्ञास्तु ?) ते त्रिदशनाथ, दशाननस्य
सन्धौ विदेहदुहितुश्च समागमेऽस्मिन् ।
प्रत्याशयान्तिकगतस्य विभीषणस्य
लङ्कां प्रदाय न विना धृतिमेति रामः ॥

But the vigilant Lakṣmaṇa, who had always a shrewd suspicion on such occasions and who had seen through even the deceit of the golden deer, finds out the fraud and magic employed in this peace-proposal; when he sets at nought this design of Rāvaṇa, Rāvaṇa is infuriated, throws away his guise and threatens Lakṣmaṇa. One of the *Sāttvatī-aṅgas* is the *Parivartaka* or foiling of a plot; and to illustrate it, the NLRK. says (1283–5):—

यथा राघवाभ्युदये कूटसन्धिना सामदाने निष्फलीभूते रावणः स्वरूपमास्थाय – "दुरात्मन् लक्ष्मण, तिष्ठ, तिष्ठ" इत्यादि व्याहृतवान् ।

There are no extracts from the main part of the last *Sandhi*, the *Nirvahaṇa;* we have however an extract which gives us the *Bharatavākya* of the play. Illustrating the final element called *Praśasti* in two places (ll. 3145–6 and 898–902), NLRK. cites:—

(a) प्रशस्तिः राघवाभ्युदये "प्रीतः पृथ्वीम्" इत्यादि ।

(b) प्रशस्तिः यथा —

प्रीतः पृथ्वीमवतु नृपतिः स्वस्ति भूयाद् द्विजेभ्यः
क्षेमं गावो दधतु, समये तोयमब्दाः सृजन्तु ।
काव्यात्कामं स्फुटरससुधावाहिनी काव्यकर्तुः
कीर्तिः स्निग्धा रघुपतिकथेवानघा दीर्घमास्ताम् ॥

It is unfortunate that the poet who prayed in the *Bharatavākya* for lasting fame should have been forgotten and has to be resurrected from pieces of citations. On the side of the plot, the *Rāghavābhyudaya* shows some lively originality and in respect of the style, the passages presented above reveal a play in which a simple and straight diction has been employed and the movement of the plot is not hampered by reason of too many poetic effusions or overwrought passages.

THE RĀMĀNANDA

Rāmānanda is another of the lost Rāma-plays; it is not quoted by Bhoja with mention of its name, but two of its verses are quoted by him anonymously, and from external evidence we are able to identify that those two verses are from a lost Rāma-play called Rāmānanda. One of these two verses is of importance since it raises a point of textual criticism regarding the current version of the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti.

It is from Siṅgabhūpāla's RAS. that we come to know that these two verses referred to are from Rāmānanda. Siṅgabhūpāla quotes a third verse also from the *Prastāvanā* of the Rāmānānda. RAS, TSS. p. 248:—

यथा **रामानन्दे** –

खं वस्ते खलविङ्ककण्ठमलिनं कादम्बिनीकम्बलं
चर्चां वर्ण(पार)यतीव दर्दुरकुलं कोलाहलैरुन्मदम्।
गन्धं मुञ्चति सिक्तलाजसुरभिः वर्षेण सिक्ता (दग्धा) स्थली
दुर्लक्षोऽपि विभाव्यते कमलिनीहासे च (हासेन) भासांपतिः॥

This beautiful description of the rainy season is quoted anonymously by Bhoja in the SKA. p. 620, where the verse has variants at three places as shown above in the brackets. Again on p. 255, the RAS. says:—

यथा **रामानन्दे** –

व्यर्थं यत्र कपीन्द्रसख्यमपि मे व्यर्थं कपीनामपि
प्रज्ञा जाम्बवतोऽपि यत्र न गतिः पुत्रस्य वायोरपि।

मार्गं यत्र न विश्वकर्मतनयः कर्तुं नलोऽपि क्षमः
सौमित्रेरपि पत्रिणामविषये तत्र प्रिया क्वापि मे ।।

This verse is quoted by Bhoja in the Śṛ. Pra. Vol. IV. pp. 657–8 and in the SKA. 506. In the SKA. and Śṛ. Pra. the following variants are seen :—

क्लेशः कपीनां वृथा
and वीर्यं हरीणां वृथा } [1] for व्यर्थं कपीनामपि

अविषयः for अविषये

Now this verse which Siṅgabhūpāla attributes to *Rāmānanda* is now found as verse 45 in Act III. of the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. If we examine the text of the URC. carefully, we can easily see that this verse 'व्यर्थं यत्र' has no place there, that it belongs to a similar situation in a similar drama, and that some scribe or over-enthusiastic connoisseur was responsible for adding it in the URC. The context in the URC. is this:—Rāma is in his second great separation from Sītā; he contrasts the second with the first; he considers the second as greater in sorrow and gives reasons why the first separation when Rāvaṇa carried Sītā away was not so unbearable.

रामः – अन्य एवायमधुना विपर्ययो वर्तते ।

उपायानां भावादविरलविनोदव्यतिकरै-
र्विमर्दैर्वीराणां जनितजगदत्यद्भुतरसः ।
वियोगो मुग्धाक्ष्याः स खलु रिपुघातावधिरभून्
कटुस्तूष्णीं सह्यो निरवधिरयं तु प्रविलयः ।।

1. One of these two is to be adopted, as the RAS. reading is incorrect.

सीता – बहुमानितास्मि पूर्वविरहे। निरवधिरिति हा हतास्मि। (छाया)

रामः – कष्टं भोः!

व्यर्थं यत्र कपीन्द्रसख्यमपि मे वीर्यं हरीणां वृथा-

... ...

सौमित्रेरपि पत्रिणामविषये तत्र प्रिये क्वासि मे॥

सीता – बहुमानितास्मि पूर्वविरहे।

रामः – सखि वासन्ति! दुःखायैव सुहृदामिदानीं रामदर्शनम्। कियच्चिरं त्वा रोदयिष्यामि। तदनुजानीहि मां गमनाय।

Here the second verse 'व्यर्थं यत्र' does nothing more than repeat the idea of the first verse उपायानां भावात्. That is, it elaborates the idea of Upāya-abhāva and explains how the second '*Viyoga*' is '*Niravadhi*.' Secondly Sītā's remark on the first verse is meaningful; but her remark on the second does not even bear any relevancy, and is a mere repetition of the first part of the previous remark on the first verse. The transfer of this verse from *Rāmānanda* to the URC. is also responsible for making the verse an apostrophe to Sītā, and reading the last part of the verse तत्र प्रिये क्वापि मे found in the SKA., Sṛ. Pra. and RAS. into तत्र प्रिया क्वासि मे, which those responsible for the insertion thought would ease the way of this verse going into into the URC. I am disposed to consider that this verse does not belong to Act III of the URC. and that its original place is the now lost Rāma-drama, *Rāmānanda* by name.

The third verse quoted from the *Prastāvanā* of the *Rāmānanda*, by Siṅgabhūpāla is on p. 269 of

his RAS. and illustrates the type of poet called the modest one, *vinīta*.

यथा रामानन्दे —

गुणो न कश्चिन्मम वाङ्निबन्धे
लभ्येत यत्नेन गवेषितोऽपि ।
तथाप्यमुं रामकथाप्रबन्धं
सन्तोऽनुरागेण समाद्रियन्ते ॥

Śāradātanaya refers to a *Rāmānanda*, a play, twice in his Bhā. Pra. Perhaps the *Rāmānanda* mentioned by him is identical with the one quoted by Siṅgabhūpāla. First, Śāradātanaya quotes it for illustrating "deviation from the original," the *Utpādya aṁśa* in a *Prakhyāta Vastu*. It is said by him that Vibhīṣaṇa is here introduced to us at some length even before Sītā is carried away by Rāvaṇa.

पूर्ववृत्ताश्रयमपि किञ्चिदुत्पाद्यवस्तु च ।
विधेयं नाटकमिति मातृगुप्तेन भावितम् ॥
प्रागेव सीताहरणात् यद् विभीषणवर्णनम् ।
तद्वस्तूत्पाद्यमेतत्तु रामानन्दे प्रदृश्यते ॥

—Bhā. Pra. VIII. P. 234–5.

In IX. p. 258, Śāradātanaya says that the *Rāmānanda* is a dramatic piece of the *Uparūpaka* class, the type called *Śrīgadita*, in which the whole piece is worked out as the description of her lover's exploits by a separated and yearning lady addressing her friends.

उत्कण्ठिता पठेद्गायेत् पाठ्यं वा गीतमेव वा ।
एवंविधं श्रीगदितं रामानन्दं यथा कृतम् ॥

We have no evidence to verify this. Bhoja, whose

description of *S'rigadita* is borrowed by Śāradātanaya, does not give *Rāmānanda* or any other play as an example of it. That the *S'rigadita Rāmānanda* is different from the *Nāṭaka* of that name considered earlier could be seen from a reference to the latter in the NLRK. where Sāgaranandin refers to it as an example of the type called *Nāṭaka*: line 385 प्रधानस्य *(i.e., Nāyakasya)* निर्देशाद् वस्तुनिर्देशाद्वा नाटकादीनां नाम कर्तव्यम्। यथा **जानकीराघवं** नाम नाटकम, **रामानन्दम्**।[1]

Sāgaranandin has also another reference, a few lines before this to the *Rāmānanda* having a *Saṅkīrṇa Viṣkambha* featuring lower characters like the Kṣapaṇaka and Kāpālika (line 373), a reference found also in the SD. (p. 293, N. S. Press edn. of 1922) and Rucipati's gloss on the *Anargharāghava* (p. 70, N. S. Press edn.). The name Kṣapaṇa-Kāpālika is found cited twice by Sāgaranandin as that of a specific Act of a Rāma-play, lines 3113, 3117; first it is cited to illustrate *sādhana* and then, to illustrate *camatkāra*.

१. व्याहारविशेषः **साधनम्**। यथा क्षपणकापालिके– भवतु मन्त्रेण वशीकरोमि। (l. 3113)

२. चमत्कारो लोकप्रसिद्ध एव। यथा क्षपणकापालिके – ही मातके (हीमाणके)! रामलक्ष्मणेन (णाभ्यां) रक्षिते दण्डकारण्ये आकाश (र?) यति मां लङ्कायामिति। (l. 3117)

---

1. For a mention of the Rāmānanda as an example of a Nāṭaka-name of the specifically non-significant type, see VJ. p. 243.

The earliest writer now known to quote any of these three verses is Rājaśekhara who quotes खं वस्ते anonymously on p. 109, KM. to illustrate the *Anuvṛtti*-stage of a season. Therefore the play is earlier than *c.* 900 A. D.

THE MĀYĀPUṢPAKA

The earliest writer to quote from this play is Abhinavagupta who refers to it three times in his Abhi. Bhā. Illustrating the element of Nāṭyadharmī which consists of introducing abstract ideas in personified forms (NŚ. XIII. 75), Abhinavagupta refers to the entry of the curse, Brahma-śāpa, as a character in Māyāpuṣpaka.

यथा **मायापुष्पके** "ततः प्रविशति ब्रह्मशापः" इति ।

— P. 216. GOS, edn. II.

That this entry of the Brahma-śāpa appears at the very opening of the play is known from the ND. where it is mentioned as illustrating Bīja, ND. p. 43.

कचिद्व्यसननिवृत्तिफले रूपके व्यसनोपक्षेपरूपम् । यथा **माया-पुष्पके** शापः प्रविश्य वचनक्रमेणाह —

कैकेयी क पतिव्रता भगवती कैवंविधं वाग्विषं
धर्मात्मा क रघूद्वहः क गमितोऽरण्यं सजायानुजः ।
क स्वच्छो भरतः क वा पितृवधान्मात्राधिकं दह्यते
किं कृत्वेति कृतो मया दशरथे वध्ये कुलस्य क्षयः ॥

From this it is clear that the Brahma-śāpa that is introduced in a personified form at the outset is the curse which the blind Muni had pronounced on Daśaratha in his young days when the latter had shot down in his hunt the former's son filling his waterpot, mistaking him to be an elephant. The dramatist lays hold here of an episode which is an integral part of the story, for the whole sequence of

events, the miscarriage of the proposed coronation, the exile of Rāma and the death of Daśaratha in the sorrow of his separation from Rāma, appeared as the nemesis of Daśaratha's former act of killing the Muni-kumāra. While this is implied in the original story, the originality of the author of the Māyāpuṣpaka is that this curse is brought on to the Stage in a personified form and is made to play an active and visible role.

Two other quotations in the Abhi. Bhā. and one in the ND. have reference to its Patākā or the part played in the play by Sugrīva. The point for whose illustration the Māyāpuṣpaka is quoted is the concept of Anusandhis or Minor Sandhis forming part of the Patākā-action. The ND. says (P. 48):—

तेन द्विप्रभृतयोऽनुसन्धयो भवन्ति —

दुर्गं भृत्यममात्यभृत्यसुहृदो दाराः शरीरं धनं
मानो वैरिविमर्दसौख्यममरप्रख्येन सख्योन्नतिः ।
यस्मात्सर्वमिदं प्रियाविरहिणस्तस्याद्य शक्ता वयं
न स्वेच्छासुलभैः पथोऽपि घटने शैलाम(श्म)खण्डैरपि ॥

अत्र मुखादिसन्धिनिबन्धनीयं रामेण सह मैत्र्यादिकमभ्यूह्य-मुपकल्प्य सुग्रीववचनात्, रामशक्तिसंपन्नाभ्युदयं निर्वहणस्यैव वृत्तमुप-निबद्धमिति ।

Abhinavagupta quotes this same verse, mentioning Māyāpuṣpaka, in a different context to illustrate Sūcābhinaya (pp. 169-70, GOS. III). The speaker of the verse, it is clear, is Sugrīva, and from the meaning, it is clear it is spoken by him on the

seashore, before the building of the causeway. Sugrīva recalls to himself all the help and happiness he had received from his friend Rāma and bemoans that for his part he is not able even to build a causeway with the stones easily available all around there. To illustrate the concept of Anusandhis within the Patākā-part of the story, Abhinavagupta quotes quite a different verse which seems to be spoken by Rāvaṇa or one on his side. Whether actually introduced or implied or left to be inferred, these internal sub-Sandhis are there in the Patākā. (GOS. III. p. 17):—

यथा मायापुष्पके —

वाली यथा विनिहतः प्रथितप्रभावो
दग्धा यथैककपिना प्रसभं च लङ्का ।
तीर्णो यथा जलनिधिर्गिरिसेतुना च
मन्ये तथा विलसितं चपलस्य धातुः ॥

This verse should occur in a context later than that of the previous verse spoken by Sugrīva.

The VJ. mentions Māyāpuṣpaka twice:— First (P. 243, De's edn.) Kuntaka mentions it as an example of a title of a drama which gives an idea of its pivotal motif:—

प्रधानं प्रबन्धप्राणगतप्रायं यत्संविधानं कथायोजनं तदङ्कः चिह्नमुपलक्षणं यस्य तत्तथोक्तं तच्च तन्नाम ... यथा अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल-मुद्राराक्षस-प्रतिमानिरुद्ध-मायापुष्पक-कृत्यारावण-छलितराम-पुष्पदूषित-कादीनि ।

We can see from this observation that the motif of a magical Puṣpaka-vimāna is effectively used in the play; it can be even surmised that this is used by Rāvaṇa, but in what exact manner and in what stage of the plot this is used is more than what we can say from the meagre extracts available to us.

In the second reference (p. 244), Kuntaka mentions Māyāpuṣpaka as one of the Rāmāyaṇa-plays which had succeeded in playing variations on the same theme. That these variations are both original and interesting so far as the Māyāpuṣpaka goes is borne out by the extracts above discussed, meagre though these are.

THE RĀGHAVĀNANDA

Another Rāma-play now lost and of which we come to know a little from Bhoja's Śṛ. Pr. is *Rāghavānanda*, from which Bhoja quotes two verses. The drama possessed undoubted literary merit. As its name suggests, it should have ended with the victory over Rāvaṇa. Of its author we know nothing.

The following are the two quotations from the *Rāghavānanda* in the Śṛ. Pra.

1. P. 530. Vol. II. यथा राघवानन्दे —

अङ्के न्यस्तोत्तमाङ्गः प्लवगबलपतेः पादमक्षस्य हन्तुः
कृत्वोत्सङ्गे सलीलं त्वचि कनकमृगस्याङ्गशेषं निधाय ।
बाणं रक्षःकुलघ्नं प्रगुणितमनुजेनादरात्तीक्ष्णमक्ष्णः
कोणेनावेक्षमाणः त्वदनुजवचने दत्तकर्णोऽयमास्ते ।।

2. P. 535. यथा राघवानन्दे कुम्भकर्णो रावणमुद्दिश्य —

रामोऽसौ जगतीह विक्रमगुणैः यातः प्रसिद्धिं परा-
मस्मद्भाग्यविपर्ययात् यदि परं देवो न जानाति तम् ।
बन्दीवैष यशांसि गायति मरुद् यस्यैकबाणाहति-
श्रेणीभूतविशालसालविवरोद्गीर्णैः स्वरैस्सप्तभिः ।।

The *Kāvyapradīpa* quotes the latter verse anonymously. The reference to this verse as from *Rāghavābhyudaya* found in Sāgaranandin (line 1660) is due to a ms. error.

The drama *Rāghavānanda* must not be confused with the last act of Rājaśekhara's *Bālarāmāyaṇa* which is also called *Rāghavānanda*.

The above do not exhaust the Rāma-plays produced in the heyday of classical Sanskrit drama, nor the imaginative variations that the poets of this period worked on the basic Rāmāyaṇa-theme. There are a few more plays, as also titles of Acts of plays, on the Rāmāyaṇa theme, cited in works of poetics and dramaturgy, which too, it may be worthwhile to notice here.

THE SVAPNA DAŚĀNANA

Bhīmaṭa, according to a verse of Rājaśekhara recorded in the Sūktimuktāvali, was a chief of Kālañjara. The above-mentioned verse of Rājaśekhara credits him with five plays and adds that the foremost of these five is a play on the Rāmāyaṇa-theme, called the *Svapnadaśānana*. As plays having such names have to take these names after a pivotal motif, it would be highly interesting to know how Bhīmaṭa worked out his plot and effected the innovations called in the wake of the title-incident of Rāvaṇa's dream.

कालञ्जरपतिश्चक्रे भीमटः पञ्चनाटकीम् ।[1]
प्राप प्रबन्धराजत्वं तेषु स्वप्नदशाननम् ॥

THE ABHIJĀTA JĀNAKĪ

The *Abhijātajānakī*, taking its name after the heroine, is once met with in the VJ. where Kuntaka

1. Another of his five plays is Manoramā-vatsarāja, on the Udayana-theme quoted in his name in ND. p. 144. If Bhīma and Bhīmaṭa are the same, as they probably are, one more play of his related to the Cāṇakya story is known, the Pratijñā-Cāṇakya, which the Abhi. Bhā. quotes twice (GOS. II. 161, 425).

quotes it prominently as exemplifying the original elements which poets introduce into the framework of old stories. Act III of this Nāṭaka is mentioned and quotations are made here from the context preceding the building of the causeway. Unfortunately, owing to the corrupt nature of the ms. here, certain portions of the citation and Kuntaka's observations on them are not clear. The original idea meant to be given as illustration is that even before any decision has been taken by Rāma or any discussion has been held as to how they could cross the sea, Nīla and other monkeys at the very sight of the sea exclaim that they could easily build a causeway with the rocks lying around. A remark of Rāma and a verse of Jāmbavān, from the same situation are also quoted.

(Mad. Ms. 3332, De's edn. 222–3):—

यथाभिज्ञातजानकीनास्ति(नाम्नि) नामके (नाटके) तृतीयेऽङ्के सेतुप्रबन्धे अनाकलिततलविधाखलानां (?) अविदितवैदेहीदायित[स्या]स्त्रप्रभावसम्पदाम् अवान्तर(वानर)प्रवीराणां प्रथममेव मकराकरमालोकयतां बन्धाध्यवसायप्रकरणम्। तथा हि[1] तत्र नीलस्य सेनापतेर्वचनम्—

शैलाः सन्ति सहस्रशः प्रतिदिशं वल्मीककल्पा इमे
दोर्दण्डाश्च कठोरविक्रमरसक्रीडासमुत्कण्ठकाः।
कर्णास्वादितजम्भसम्भवकथा किन्नाम कल्लोलिनी
प्रायो गोष्पदपूरणेऽपि कपयः कौतूहलं नास्ति वः॥

वानराणामुत्तरवाक्यं नेपथ्ये कलकलानन्तरम्—

1. Upto this from the Mad. Ms. of VJ.

आन्दोलयन्ते कति न गिरयः कन्दुकानन्दमुद्रां
व्यातन्वानां करपरिसरे कौतुकोत्कर्षहर्षे ।
लोपामुद्रापरिवृढकथाभिज्ञताप्यस्ति किन्तु
व्रीडावेशः पवनतनयोच्छिष्टसंस्पर्शनेन ॥

[1]बन्धाध्यवसाय इति रामेण पर्यनुयुक्तजाम्बवतोऽपि वाक्यम्—

अनङ्कुरितनिःसीममनोरथरुहेष्वपि ।
कृतिनस्तुल्यसंरम्भमारभन्ते जयन्ति च ॥

THE ABHINAVARĀGHAVA

The *Abhinavarāghava* is only once cited in the ND. and as that citation is from the prologue, we get information of the author but not of the theme or how the author dealt with it. Illustrating Prarocanā, the ND. says (P. 155):—

–प्ररोचना । यथा क्षीरस्वामिविरचितेऽभिनवराघवे –

स्थापकः — (सहर्षम्) आर्ये चिरस्य स्मृतम् ।

अस्त्येव राघवमहीनकथापवित्रं
काव्यं प्रबन्धघटनाप्रथितप्रथिम्नः ।
भट्टेन्दुराजचरणाब्जमधुव्रतस्य
क्षीरस्य नाटकमनन्यसमानसारम् ॥

As the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭendurāja could only be the guru of the name mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his Locana, Kṣīrasvāmin who wrote this play and describes himself as pupil of Bhaṭṭendurāja must have been a contemporary of Abhinavagupta in the last part of the 10th century and beginning of the 11th;

1. Mad. Ms. VJ.

he may or may not be identical with the grammarian of that name, the author of Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī etc.

THE MĀRĪCAVAÑCITA

The *Mārīcavañcita* takes its name after the pivotal incident of the deceit played by Mārīca in the guise of the golden deer, which enabled Rāvaṇa to carry off Sītā. Śāradātanaya refers to it twice; Bhā. Pra. P. 217, ll. 13-14 and P. 223, l. 2. The second reference tells us that this is a Nāṭaka in five acts:—

अङ्काः स्युस्तत्र पञ्चाङ्कमेतन्मारीचवञ्चितम् ।

From the first reference, we know that the story of the play extended upto the end of the war; Śāradātanaya mentions Vibhīṣaṇa and a Praveśaka in which two demons Ulkāmukha and Dīrghajihva figure and an untoward development was brought to an amicable conclusion:—

प्रवेशकेन न वधो नायकस्य कदाचन ।
विधेयः, कार्यमन्तेऽत्र सन्धिर्वाप्यपसारणम् ॥

यथा विभीषणेनात्र सन्धिरुल्कामुखस्य च ।
दीर्घजिह्वस्य मारीचवञ्चिते नाटके कृतः ॥

THE RĀMAVIKRAMA

The *Rāmavikrama* is a Nāṭaka on the earlier Rāmāyaṇa story and not on the story of the Uttarakāṇḍa. The poet, it is interesting to note, brings Janaka into the picture and makes him learn of the perilous life which Rāma and Sītā have to lead amidst the Rākṣasas in the forest. The NLRK,

quotes from the second Act of the play; ll. 676–82, conversation between Janaka and a Brahmacārin from the forest :—

यथा रामविक्रमे द्वितीयेऽङ्के —

जनकः – भद्र ! कुत आगम्यते ।

बटुः – आर्य ! अरण्यतः । (छाया)

जनकः – किं तत्र श्रोतुमध्येतुं वा न प्राप्यते, येन दूरतराध्वक्लेशोऽनुभूयते ।

बटुः – कुतोऽपि हि (?) राक्षसैर्विरोधो भूत आर्याणाम् । अध्वा वै तपस्विजनोचितो व्यापारः । (छाया) इत्यादि ।

From the way in which the imagination of these playwrights worked, we may assume that this Brahmacārin is really a Rākṣasa in guise. It is clear from the mention of the above extract as from Act II that the opening Act of the Rāmavikrama dealt with the disturbed coronation and exile.

STRAY ACTS

More interesting are the titles of separate Acts which the NLRK quotes from some Rāma-plays which I have not so far been able to identify.

An Act called *Ayodhyābharata* is twice cited by Sāgaranandin, ll. 1710, 2976 :—

(*a*) Illustration of the Lakṣaṇa *Guṇakīrtana* :—

यथायोध्याभरते – भग्नं येन धनुः इत्यादि

which is a praise of Rāma.

(*b*) Illustration of *Chala*:—

यथायोध्याभरते —

लक्ष्मणः – सकलराक्षसकुलक्षयकारिणि युष्मद्भुजद्वये सति किमसौ करिष्यति ।

प्रविश्य त्रिजटा – सीतावियोगम् । (छाया)

Now these two references are quite intriguing. While the title Ayodhyābharata may be that of an early or even the opening Act of the play, it cannot be guessed how the poet brings on Trijaṭā at such an early stage. The second extract is a speech of Lakṣmaṇa addressed to Rāma and would suggest a later context, or even one towards the end. But then, Ayodhyābharata is an Act-name, not a play-name!

The *Kekayībharata*, NLRK. 1685 and 1764 is equally intriguing. The two references to it are too meagre to give any clue to the theme or its treatment.

(*a*) Illustration of *Sārūpya*:—

यथा केकयीभरते —

उत्सर्पति स्थिरतडिज्जलदः किमेषः

(*b*) Illustration of *Arthaviśeṣaṇa*:—

यथा केकयीभरते हनूमान् –

केकेयी जननी न यस्य स कथं विघ्नं समाधास्यति । इति ।

The *Daśarathāṅka* is expressly mentioned as an Act and from the name and the contents of which we have two glimpses, it is clearly from the beginning art of the play.

(*a*) NLRK. 1002–3, illustration of the first Patākāsthānaka :—

यथा **दशरथाङ्के** दशरथः रामस्य राज्ये चिन्त्यमाने भरतस्य राज्यं तल्लिङ्गजातमिति विषादेनागन्तुकभावेन गृहीतः पठति – 'रामोऽपि गच्छतु वनम्' इत्यादि ।

(*b*) Ibid. 1782. Illustration of a hasty word resulting in an undreamt of calamity, *Visarpa* :—

यथा **दशरथाङ्के** कञ्चुकी—

सामान्येन वरं (रो) दत्तं (त्तः) किं विशेषे मतिः स्थिता ।
सर्वथा नृपतेरेव घोरः शापो विजृम्भते ॥

Daśarathāṅka is thus the Act in which Kaikeyī takes her boons and Rāma leaves for the forest.

The *Prāvṛḍaṅka* is, as its name bears out, the Act in which, during the Rains, Rāma was waiting in his cave in the Mālyavat mountain for Sugrīva to take steps to help him. There are three citations from it in the NLRK.

(*a*) L. 289: **प्रावृडङ्के** कङ्कालकेन वालिमरणं च ।

The context is the elucidation of the nature and purpose of the Praveśaka. From the illustration, we are to gather that in the Praveśaka to this Act Kaṅkālaka, a lower character, informs the audience of the killing of Vālin and that the main Act depicted Rāma's forlorn state in the Mālyavat cave during the Rains. The next citation in the NLRK. gives a beautiful lyric from Rāma's mouth :—

(*b*) Ll. 3046–52: प्रयत्नः । यथा **प्रावृडङ्के**–

अये अन्विष्टेयं (अनन्विष्टेयं ?) मया वनराजी । यावदेनां विचिनोमि । (परिक्रम्यावलोक्य) कथमत्रापि नास्ति । कष्टं भोः कष्टम्—

सर्वत्राम्बुमुचो ध्वनन्ति कुटजामोदोऽपि सर्वत्रगः
सर्वत्रैव च ताण्डवव्यसनिनां केकाः कला बर्हिणाम् ।
आर्याप्राप्तिनिराशमेव कलितं चार्यस्य मे मानसं
येनास्मिंस्तदवस्थितेः समुचितो नोद्देश एव क्षतः ॥ इति ।

More pathetic is the condition of Rāma as revealed in the third extract (ll. 3120-1) in which he asks Lakṣmaṇa where the latter had been all that time.

—शून्यत्वम् । यथा प्रावृडङ्के—

वत्स ! इयतीं वेलां क गतो भवानासीत् ।

The *Vibhīṣaṇanirbhartsanāṅka* is one more Act whose theme is obvious but from which we do not have extracts long or numerous enough to throw light on any original ideas that the poet might have introduced here. The bit cited by Sāgaranandin mentions Vibhīṣaṇa going over to the more meritorious side. NLRK. l. 1808 :—

आश्रयः गुणवद्ग्रहणम् । यथा विभीषणनिर्भर्त्सनाङ्के विभीषणः 'राममेवाश्रयिष्यामि' इति ।

The *Śaktyaṅka* is obviously the one relating to the battle of Laṅkā, in which Lakṣmaṇa is hit down by Rāvaṇa's Śakti weapon. Sāgaranandin quotes it four times ;

L. 338 :—This refers to the Praveśaka where the NLRK. says two monkeys figure.

—प्रवेशके नीच एव कर्तव्यः । यथा शक्त्यङ्के वानरद्वयम् ।

L. 388 :—The second reference is to individual Acts of a play having significant names :—

वस्तुनिर्देशात् मृच्छकटिका नाम प्रकरणम् । अङ्कोऽपि सुग्रीवाङ्कः । शक्तिर्नामाङ्कः ।

L. 967 :—The reference here clinches the theme of this Act as Lakṣmaṇa being hit by the Śakti.

रुजः प्रहारादिप्रभवा वेदनाः । यथा शक्त्यङ्के लक्ष्मणः ।

L. 1749 :—This is further corroborated by this citation which mentions Rāma's apostrophies to Lakṣmaṇa in his sorrow in this context :—

आक्रन्दः शोकसमुत्थ(म्) मुक्तधैर्यम् ... यथा 'वत्से(स)! तिष्ठ' इति शक्तौ रामः ।

A fuller citation comprising two verses of Rāma's lament in this situation is given by Allarāja in his Rasaratnapradīpika[1] (P. 32):

शक्त्यङ्के शक्तिभिन्नं लक्ष्मणं दृष्ट्वा रामः –

गतप्राया रात्रिः हिमवति गिरौ द्रोणशिखरं
गता वत्सस्यैते गलकनलके किञ्चिदसवः ।
हनूमानप्यार्यः क्षितिनिहितगात्रः किमपरं
विधिर्वामारम्भः तदपि च मनो वाञ्छति सुखम् ॥

पुनरञ्जलिं बद्ध्वा रामः–

मातर्यामिनि संनिधेहि करुणं दीर्घीभवाभ्यर्थये
भ्रातः सन्तमस स्थिरीभव चिरं ज्योतींषि खे नन्दत ।

1. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series 8, 1945.

मा यासीरुदयं दयां कुरु रवे त्राता त्वमस्मत्कुले
वत्सो जीवतु लक्ष्मणोऽरुण मनाङ् मन्दं नय स्यन्दनम् ॥

The *Sampātyaṅka* takes its name after the brother of Jaṭāyus whom the southern party of monkeys comprising Jāmbavān, Aṅgada and Hanumān, encounter and from whom they learn of the actual whereabouts of Sītā. The author of the Rāma-play from which this Act is cited had worked into this context some innovations, such as an attempt of the Rākṣasas to dupe the monkeys and bring them to grief. A deceitful lady character, a Rākṣasī named Māyāvatī, is introduced who tries her wits on Aṅgada, Hanumān and others:—

NLRK. ll. 749–50:

–प्रार्थना । यथा संपात्यङ्के–

मायावती–धूर्त ! कुतो मां प्रतारयसि अन्वनुदिवसमनुरात्रम् ।

NLRK. ll. 758–60: कपटस्यान्यथाकरणमधिबलम् ।

यथा संपात्यङ्के –

हनूमान् – रावणप्रयुक्तयानया भवितव्यम् ।

अङ्गदः – न तावदस्याः कपटातिसन्धाने दूरमधिमग्नाः स्मः ।

NLRK. ll. 761–5 show despondent Aṅgada soliloquising on their failure to locate Sītā and as to how they could face Rāma and Sugrīva:—

नृपतिजनितभयमुद्वेगः । संपात्यङ्के अङ्गदः सोद्वेगम् –

किं दृष्टा युवराज इत्यभिहितः पापोऽहमिक्ष्वाकुणा
किं संचिन्त्य मयापि वानरपतेराज्ञेयमालम्बिता ।

भ्रान्त्वा शैलपरम्परास्वपि मया दृष्टा न सा मैथिली
किं वक्ष्यामि वनान्निवृत्य जडधीराज्ञास्थिते राघवे ॥

The last extract from this Act is Mālyavān's advice to Rāvaṇa to desist from his evil doings; it is not known how this fits into this Act. Illustrating Prasiddhi or the enunciation of some wellknown facts, Sāgaranandin says (ll. 1666-70):—

यथा सम्पात्यङ्के माल्यवान् –

जातो मुनेर्विश्रवसः समस्त-
विद्यास्वधीती परमो विविक्तः ।
निपात्यसे वत्स किमेभिरुग्रैः
तटद्रुमः सिन्धुजलैरिवाद्यैः ॥

Perhaps, to turn back the monkeys coming in search, Rāvaṇa, having got news of their reaching the sea-shore, thinks of killing a Māyā-Sītā before the very eyes of the monkeys so that they might return to Rāma and report that Sītā was no more; and Mālyavān is pleading with his nephew that such acts are unbecoming of him.

INDEX

WORKS AND AUTHORS

SANSKRIT

Aṭavyaṅka—41
Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa—42
Anaṅgaharṣa Māyurāja—xii, 5. See also Māyurāja
Anargharāghava—Rucipati's gloss on—86
Anutāpa-aṅka—56, 57
Abhijātajānakī—93-95
Abhijñānaśākuntala—90. See also Śākuntala
Abhinanda—38 fn.
Abhinavagupta—vii, xii, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 25, 30, 39, 42, 44–46, 88–90, 95
Abhinavabhāratī—(Abhi. Bhā.) vii, 8, 10, 12, 17, 18, 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 58, 88–90, 93 fn.
Abhinavarāghava—95, 96
Amaruśataka—69, 70
Ayodhyābharata-aṅka—97, 98
Arthaśāstra—x
Allarāja—101
Avaloka—vii, 11, 23, 50, 51, 54, 57. See also Daśarūpakāvaloka
Ānandavardhana—ix, 1–4, 6, 7, 20–22, 25
Uḍāli—55 fn.
Uttarakāṇḍa—x, 10, 11, 96
Uttararāmacarita (URC)—8, 50, 54, 58, 59, 68 fn., 82–84
Udāttarāghava—xii, 5, 39 fn.
Aucityavicāracarcā—25
Kaviputra—vi

Kavīndravacanasamuccaya—24
Kālidāsa—vi
Kāvyapradīpa—92
Kāvyamīmāṁsā (KM)—87
Kāvyānuśāsana-22; commentary on, by Hemacandra, 13
Kuntaka—vii, x, 26, 90, 93, 94
Kundamālā—54
Kulapati-aṅka—39 fn.
Kṛtyārāvaṇa—xii, 4, 26–49, 90
Kekayībharata-aṅka—98
Kṣapaṇakāpālika-aṅka—86
Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī—96
Kṣīrasvāmin—95
Kṣemendra—22, 23, 25
Guṇacandra—vii, 9, 27
Chalitarāma—xii, 4, 26, 50–59, 90
Jayadeva—viii
Jalhaṇa—20–22
Jānakīpariṇaya—5
Jānakīrāghava—60–73, 86
Daśaratha-aṅka—98–99
Daśarūpaka—vii, 50
Daśarūpakavyākhyā of Bahurūpamiśra—5, 12
Daśarūpakāvaloka (DRA) of Dhanika—8, 11, 19, 50 (See also Avaloka)
Devīcandragupta—xi fn.
Dhanañjaya—vii
Dhanika—vii, 50, 53
Dhvanyāloka (Dhva. Ā) 2, 3, 6, 8, 19, 21
Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (NLRK)—vii, 6, 9, 19, 41, 43, 55, 56, 60–67, 70, 72, 74, 76–78, 80, 86, 96–102

Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND)—vii, 8, 10–15, 17–19, 26–29, 31–32, 35, 37, 38, 40–54, 74 fn., 88, 89, 93 fn., 95
Nāṭyaśāstra (NŚ)—12, 75, 88, 89
Nāṭyaśāstra-vyākhyā by Abhinavagupta. See under Abhinavabhāratī—vii
Nirdoṣadaśaratha-aṅka—5
Puṁsavana-aṅka—55, 56
Puṣpadūṣitaka—90
Pratijñā-cāṇakya—93 fn.
Pratimāniruddha—90
Prasannarāghava—viii, ix
Prāvṛḍ-aṅka—99, 100
Bahurūpamiśra—5, 6, 12, 13
Bālarāmāyaṇa—5, 63, 92
Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa—vi
Bhaṭṭendurāja—95
Bhavabhūti—vi, xii, 1, 4, 8, 28, 58, 63, 68 fn., 82, 83
Bhāvaprakāśa (Bhā. Pra.)—vii, 8, 10, 16, 26, 29, 56, 85, 86, 96
Bhāsa—vi
Bhīma—93 fn.
Bhīmaṭa—93
Bhoja—vii, xii, 3, 6, 7, 14, 16, 17, 21, 34–36, 53, 54, 57, 82, 83, 85, 92
Manoramā-vatsarāja—93 fn.
Mahābhārata—vi
Mahāvīracarita—4
Māṇikyacandra—24 fn.
Mātṛgupta—ix, 74, 85
Māyāpuṣpaka—88–91
Māyālakṣmaṇa-aṅka—68–70

Māyurāja, Anaṅgaharṣa—xii, 5, 39 fn., 63
Mārīcavañcita—96
Mālatīmādhava—8
Mālavikāgnimitra—vi
Mudrārākṣasa—90
Murāri—viii, 5, 28
Mṛcchakaṭika—52 fn.
Yaśovarman—ix, xii, 1–25
Rasaratnapradīpikā—101
Rasārṇavasudhākara (RAS)—82–85
Rāghavānanda—92, 93
Rāghavānanda (last Act of the Bālarāmāyaṇa)—92
Rāghavābhyudaya—19, 74–81, 92
Rājaputra Yaśovarman—24. See also Yaśovarman
Rājaśekhara—5, 28, 63, 87, 92, 93
Rāmacandra—vii, 8, 27, 35, 36, 46, 50
Rāmacarita—38 fn.
Rāmabhadradīkṣita—5
Rāmavikrama—96, 97
Rāmānanda (Nāṭaka)—82–87
Rāmānanda (Śrīgadita)—85–86
Rāmābhyudaya of Yaśovarman—xii, 1–26, 70
Rāmāyaṇa—vi, ix, xi, 2, 4, 9, 10, 22, 32, 42, 55, 57, 63, 74, 93, 96
Rāmāyaṇa-Uttarakāṇḍa—x, 10, 11, 96
Rāmāyaṇa, Commentary of Uḍāli—55 fn.
Rucipati, his gloss on Anargharāghava—86
Locana, Commentary by Abhinavagupta on Dhva. Ā. —2, 3, 8, 19, 21, 95
Vakroktijīvita (VJ)—vii, x, 26 fn., 86 fn., 90, 93–95
Vallabhadeva—1, 20, 22
Vākpati—1

Vāmana—8
Vālmīki—ix, 4-6, 10, 22, 23, 50, 55, 57, 58, 75-78
Vibhīṣaṇanirbhartsana-aṅka—100
Viśvanātha—vii, xii, 78
Veṇīsaṁhāra—62
Śakti-aṅka—100-102
Śaṅkuka—30, 46
Śākuntala—63. See also Abhijñānaśākuntala
Śāradātanaya—vii, 9, 16, 20, 29, 30, 39 fn., 85, 86, 96
Śārṅgadharapaddhati—1, 23, 24 fn.
Śiṅgabhūpāla—82-85
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa (Śṛ. Pra.)—vii, 3, 7, 8, 13, 14, 17, 26, 34-36, 53-55, 83, 84, 92
Śrīgadita-Rāmānanda—85, 86
Śrī-Harṣa—25
Saṁpāti-aṅka—102, 103
Saṁhāra-aṅka—61, 71, 72
Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa (SKĀ)—21, 54, 82-84
Sāgaranandin—vii, xii, 9, 19, 39 fn., 41, 43, 55, 60-62, 64, 66, 71, 73-80, 86, 92, 97, 100, 103. See also Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa
Sāhityadarpaṇa (SD)—vii, 9, 44, 52, 60, 67, 74, 77, 78, 86
Subandhu—29, 30
Subhāṣitaratnakośa—24
Subhāṣitāvalī—1, 24 fn.
Suvṛttatilaka—22-24
Sūktimuktāvalī—1, 20, 23, 24, 93
Setu-aṅka—77, 78
Saumilla—vi
Svapnadaśānana—93
Hemacandra—13, 22

ENGLISH

Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras-55 fn.
Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa—8
Concepts of Alaṅkāraśāstra—8
De (S. K.)—26 fn., 90, 94
Journal of the Benaras Hindu University—xi fn.
Journal of Oriental Research (JOR) *Madras*—1, 10 fn., 26 fn.
Keith—1, 6, 11, 24
Peterson—1
Ramamurty R.—1
Sanskrit Drama (Keith)—1 fn., 6, 11, 24
Social Play in Sanskrit—vii fn., xi fn.

SUBJECTS

Abhicāra, as a dramatic motif—27. See also Magic, Witchcraft.
Abhicāra-yajña (-yāga)—27, 42
Abhinaya of Hasta—12, Kapota-hasta—12
Acts to have significant names—101
Adbhuta (Rasa)—19, 26
Ādikāvya, as source book for dramatists—vii; -plays based on it—vii.
Agni—30, 32, 45
Ākāśabhāṣita—13; -Antara-sandhi—76
Alaṅkāras—7; of Vākya—7; -of Prabandha—7
Aṅga-rasa—28
Aṅgada—23, 24, 38 fn., 40, 42–44, 46, 70, 102
Antara-sandhi—76; -Ākāśabhāṣita—76
Anumāna-Sandhyaṅga—67
Anunaya-Sandhyaṅga—15, 72

Anusandhis—89, 90
Anuvṛtti—87; -stage of a season—87
Apavāda-Sandhyaṅga—69
Ārabhaṭī—26; -Play—27; -Vṛtti—43, 44
Artha—8
Arthaprakṛtis (elements of the plot)—75
Arthaviśeṣa—98
Arundhatī—58
Asamlakṣyakramadhvani—25
Asatpralāpa-Vīthyaṅga—14, 16
Āskanda, aṅga of Ārabhaṭī—43
Aśoka—22
Āśrama—50
Āśraya, Nāṭakālaṅkāra—100
Aśvamedha—10, 50, 57, 58; -horse—50, 57, 58; -maṇḍapa—52
Aucitya—8; -earliest occurrence of the word—8
Avagalita-Vīthyaṅga—50, 51
Avamānana, a Sandhyaṅga—11, 19
Avamarśa, Sandhi—45
Avapātana-aṅga of Ārabhaṭī-vṛtti—44, 45
Avasthās of drama-74; -Prārambha, Prayatna, Prāptisambhava, Niyataphala-samprāpti, Phalayoga-74
Avasyandita-Vīthyaṅga—51, 52
Aviyoga of Rasa—7
Ayodhyā—10, 11, 51, 52, 54, 55, 60
Bandha—50
Bharata—51, 54
Bharatavākya—28, 30, 31, 72, 80, 81
Bhāsvara-variety of Nāṭaka—29
Bhaya—45
Bīja—61, 88

Bījodbheda—67
Bījodghāṭana-Sandhyaṅga—66
Bindu—61, 75
Black-magic (motif)—18, 26
Bodhana—77, 78
Brahmacārin—97
Brahma-śāpa (motif)—88, 89
Camatkāra—86
Cāṇakya-story—93 fn.
Candraketu—50
Causeway—77, 90, 94
Chala, Vīthyaṅga—98
Chalana—11, 19
Chalita (duped)—55
Chāyā—61, 62
Citāmukha-emissary of Rāvaṇa—56, 57
Citra-nepathya (stage property)—18
Cūlikā—63, 64
Curse (motif)-76, 77, 88, 89
Dāruṇikā—46
Daśaratha—5, 6, 88
Dautya of Aṅgada—23, 24, 38 fn., 40, 42–44, 46, 70
Deceit (Kapaṭa) 3rd—56
Demons—55, 96; -agents—56
Dhvani; Asamlakṣyakrama—25; -Rasa—25
Dīrghajihva (demon)—96
Doṣa; of Vākya–7; -of Prabandha–7; -of Rasa 27, 28
Doṣa-hāna—7
Drama-good features of–4; technique of fight-description in–23; devoid of significant action—29; wordy—29; technique of introducing character in–33; naming of–60, 86; 5 Avasthās of–74,

Drava (Śaṅkā) -Sandhyaṅga—43, 45
Dream (motif)—93
'Duped-Rāma'—55
Dūṣaṇa—15, 33
Epics, the two, sources of poets—vii, 5
Fake-Lakṣmaṇa (motif)—68
,, -Puṣpaka. See Māyā
,, -Sītā. See Māyā
False peace-offer (motif)—78-80
Fight (war)—10, 23, 26, 30, 39, 45, 54, 70-72, 96, 100
Fire-god—30, 32, 48, 73
Flaws, see Doṣa
Gaṇḍa-Vīthyaṅga—76
Garbha-sandhi—45, 67
Gautamī—26, 33, 34
God: Fire (Agni)—30, 32, 48; -Wind—76
Gold image of Sītā—53, 57, 59
Golden deer—4, 5, 26, 27, 33, 34, 80, 96
Grathana-Sandhyaṅga—72
Guṇa—7, 8; -of vākya—7; -of Prabandha—7
Guṇakīrtana-Lakṣaṇa—97
Guṇālaṅkāra-yoga—7
Guṇātipāta-Lakṣaṇa—70
Hanumān—41, 67, 70, 102
Hasta (gesture of hand), kapota—12
History of Sanskrit Literature—vi; -of Drama—vii; -of Classical Sanskrit Drama-93; -of Poetics—26; -of Dramaturgy—26
Impersonation (motif)—x, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35
Indra—72, 79
Indrajit—17, 18, 27, 71

Innovations in Rāmāyaṇa theme—4, 5, 26, 27, 34-40, 42-44, 46-47, 68, 69, 72, 73, 75, 78, 80, 85, 86, 88, 89, 96, 97
Innovations in the story—ix ff, 2-4; -two main motives in—ix ff; -limits of—x; 2, 3, 4; -for purposes of Rasa—5; -to save the characters—5, 34; -to suit the purpose of dramatists—53-54; -to yield dramatic machinary—58
Itihāsas-vii; -as sources of dramatic themes-vii, viii ff.
Itivṛtta (plot)—vii, viii.
Jālinī-a Rākṣasī—78
Jāmbavān—94, 102
Janaka—58, 66, 96, 97
Jaṭāyus—28, 39, 40, 77
Kaikeyī—5, 56, 67, 99
Kaṅkālaka—99
Kāpālika—86
Kapaṭa (3rd variety)—56
Karuṇa-Rasa—26, 27, 28
Kāryamīmāṁsā-Sandhyaṅga—52
Kāvya-Śravya—29
Kāvyasaṁhāra-Sandhyaṅga—31, 48
Khara—12, 13, 15, 33, 67
Kheda—41, 71
Kiṣkindhā—40
Kṛtyā (a female evil spirit)—26, 27, 42
Kṣapaṇaka—86
Kṣatriyas—63
Kulapati—37, 39
Kumbha—71
Kumbhakarṇa—17, 18, 23, 71
Kuśa—51, 52, 57, 68 fn.
Kūṭasandhi (motif)—79, 80

Lakṣaṇa: -Sārupya—53; -Guṇātipāta—70; -Guṇa-kīrtana—97
Lakṣmaṇa—9, 11, 30, 33, 34–36, 41, 45, 46, 50, 54, 57, 68, 70, 71, 72, 77, 78, 98, 100, 101
Lalita (variety of Nāṭaka)—29
Laṅkā—11, 40, 42, 63, 66, 68, 70, 77, 78, 79, 100
Lava—50, 51, 53, 57-59
Lavaṇa—54-58
Loss of works—vi, vii.
Love: -its sambhoga aspects—64; -nine conditions of—73; -verses of—73
Mada-Vyabhicāribhāva—36
Madanāvasthās—73
Magic (motif)—x, 18, 26, 69, 80, 91
Magical Puṣpaka Vimāna (motif)—91
Mahābhārata, theme-source of poets and playwrights —vi, vii
Mālyavān—103
Mālyavān (mount)—20, 99
Maṇḍodarī—42, 43, 44
Mantharā—55 fn., 56
Mārga—67
Mārīca—13, 14–16, 23, 33, 34, 80, 96
Māya: -of Sītā—10, 18, 19, 45; -of golden deer—26, 34; -of Puṣpaka—91; -of Lakṣmaṇa—68
Māyāvatī (Rākṣasī)—102
Mithilā—63
Monkeys—10, 16, 20, 40, 70, 94, 100, 102, 103
Motifs; -impersonation—x, 26, 27, 33, 34; -magic—x, 69, 80, 91; -Māyā—10, 18, 19, 45, 68, 91, 103; -black magic—18, 26; -witchcraft—47, -curse—76, 88, 89; -Kūṭasandhi (false peace-offer)—78-80; -Brahmaśāpa—88, 89; -Rāvaṇa's dream—93.

Mukha-sandhi—61, 62
Muni—88
Munikumāra—87
Nandigrāma—54
Nāṭaka—9, 71, 86, 94, 96; -five-fold classification of—29; -classes of—vii ff.
Nāṭyadharmī—88
Nikumbhilā—27
Nīla—94
Nirodha-sandhyaṅga—52
Nirvahaṇa-sandhi—9, 10 fn., 20, 52, 61, 72, 80
Nirveda—25, 33
Nivedana—78
Niyata-phala-samprāpti - an Avasthā of drama—71, 74
Pampā—22
Pañcavaṭī—9, 12, 13, 30, 33, 54
Paraśurāma—65
Parisarpa-sandhyaṅga—64
Parivartaka (aṅga of Sāttvatī) —80
Paropakāra—39
Patākā—42, 89, 90; -action—89
Patākāsthāna 1st—99; -2nd—17; 4th—66
Paścāttāpa—56, 57
Phalayoga: -an Avasthā of drama—60, 74
Plays: -of significant titles—26, 27, 55, 60, 90, 93, 96, 98, 101, 102; -based on epics—vi
Poet, Vinīta type of—85
Prabandha, good features of—7; -guṇas of—7; -Doṣas of—7; -Alaṅkāras of—7, -Rasāviyoga—7; -Dhvani—2
Prahasta—15

Prakaraṇa (Social play) -reconstruction of lost specimens of—viii
Prakarī—39
Prakhyāta: -Itivṛtta—ix; -Vastu—85
Prāptisambhava, an Avasthā of drama—74
Prārambha, an Avasthā of drama—74
Prarocanā—95
Praśānta (variety of Nāṭaka)—29
Praśasti-Sandhyaṅga—31, 49, 80-81
Prasiddhi—103
Prastāvanā–7, 8, 9, 29, 32-33, 82, 84 (See also Prologue)
Pratīhāri—43, 44
Pratimukha Sandhi—55, 64
Praveśaka—57, 58, 96, 99, 100
Pratināyaka—26
Prauḍhi—8
Prayatna, an Avasthā of drama—74
Prelude—32, 33
Priyaṁvadā—62 - 65
Prologue—29, 32, 53, 95 (See also Prastāvanā)
Puṁsavana—55, 56
Purāṇas—vii
Pūrṇa-variety of Nāṭaka—29, 30
Pūrvānurāga-vipralambha—xi, 63
Puṣpa-sandhyaṅga—65
Puṣpaka—22, 23, 37, 38, 51, 54; -Vimāna—91
Rājarṣis—viii
Rākṣasas—55, 96, 97, 102
Rākṣasī—78, 102
Rāma-plays, three kinds of—54

Rāma—4, 5, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18–27, 30, 31, 33–35, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51–58, 60, 63, 65, 70–80, 83, 84, 90, 94, 96, 98–100

Rāmāyaṇa: -Ayodhyā—10, 11, 51, 52, 54, 55, 60; Laṅkā—11, 40, 42, 63, 66, 68, 70, 77, 78, 79, 100; Pañcavaṭī–12, 13, 30, 33, 54; Mālyavān-mountain —20, 99; Pampā—22; Kiṣkindhā—40

Rāmāyaṇa-episodes: -Sītā-svayamvara—63-64; -Bending of Śiva's bow—63, 64; -of Paraśurāma—65; -coronation, proposed—x, 54, 59; -Kaikeyī's boons—99; -of Kaikeyī—67; -Daśaratha's Śāpa —88, 89; -Exile of Rāma—x, 9, 30, 39, 67; -Death of Daśaratha—89; Rāma's forest-life—x, 9, 30, 67, 74, 75, 89, 99; -Khara-dūṣaṇa-vadha—33, 67; -of Śūrpaṇakhā—11, 12, 13, 22, 33; -False personations of Śūrpaṇakhā—26, 27, 33, 34; -Rāvaṇa's plan with Mārīca—33; -Mārīca in Viśvāmitra's sacrifice—33; -of Mārīca-96; -of the golden deer— x, 33, 34, 96; -Sītā abusing Lakṣmaṇa—34, 35, 36; Kulapati and hermits helping Rāma-37; -Abduction of Sītā—13, 14–16, 23, 30, 33, 36–39, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 70, 77, 83, 85, 96; -Loss of Sītā—74; Rāvaṇa making advances to Sītā—68; -Rāvaṇa's infatuation for Sītā—28, 69; -Discovery of Sītā's loss—39; -of Jaṭāyus—39, 40, 47; -Separation of Sītā and Rāma (Viraha)—20–22, 41, 70, 76, 99, 100, 101, 102; -Hanumān meeting Rāma—41; -Rāma meeting Sugrīva—22; -Friendship between Rāma and Sugrīva—40, 42, 67; -Vālivadha—x, 5, 6, 16, 40, 70, 99; -Sugrīva-paṭṭābhiṣeka—16; -Sugrīva's help to Rāma—99; -Monkeys going in search for Sita–102, 103; -Hanumān in Laṅkā—70;

-expedition—7; -Crossing to Laṅkā—63, 70; -building causeway- 77, 90, 94; -of Vibhīṣaṇa-100; -Vibhīṣaṇa's advice to Rāvaṇa—23; -Aṅgada's embassy—23, 24, 40–44, 70; -Aṅgada teasing Maṇḍodarī—42–44; -Rāvaṇa's Ābhicārayāga–27; Mālyavān's advice to Rāvaṇa—103: -Killing Māyā-Sītā—4, 5, 10, 18, 19, 28, 103; -Rāvaṇa and his black magic—26, 27; -Illusory murder of Rāma—46, 47; -Sītā's suicide—26, 46, 47; -Sītā-vipatti—46, 47; -Fight (war, battle)—10, 23, 26, 45, 54, 70, 72, 96, 100; -Waking up Kumbhakarṇa —17, 18; -Fall of Kumbhakarṇa—23; -Rāvaṇa's false peace-offer—78, 80; -Indrajit at Nikumbhilā —27; Lakṣmaṇa's swoon—45, 46; -Rāvaṇa-vadha—3, 30, 48, 60, 74, 76; -Final victory—45, 51, 53, 54; -Recovery of Sītā—60, 74; -Repudiation of Sītā (Sītā-parityāga)—xi, 4, 8, 11, 19, 30, 31, 32, 48; -Fire ordeal—11, 19, 30, 32, 48, 72–73; -Vibhīṣaṇa-paṭṭābhiṣeka—72; -Bringing back Sītā —63; -Meeting Bharata—51, 54; -Coronation (Paṭṭābhiṣeka)—5, 9, 11, 51, 54, 57; -Puṁsavana ceremony—55, 56; -Lavaṇa's plot against Rāma —54–58; -Rāma duped—55, 56; -Banishment of Sītā—10, 11, 36, 54, 58; -Sītā's forest life—10, 57; -(Second) Separation from Sītā—83, 84; -of a curse—76; -Aśvamedha—10, 52, 57, 58, 77; -Fight between Lava and Candraketu—50; -of Lava and Kuśa—57–59; -Recitation of Rāmāyaṇa by Lava and Kuśa—51; -Vālmīki composing the epic—10, 51; -Vālmīki training Lava and Kuśa —10; -Reunion—10, 57.

Rāmāyaṇa, innovations in its theme—xii-xiii, 4, 5, 26, 27, 34-40, 42-44, 46, 47, 62-64, 68, 69, 72, 73, 75, 78-80, 85, 86, 88, 89, 96, 97, 102

Rāmāyaṇa, theme-source of poets—vi; -plays based on—vii ff; -in regional languages—xi; -imaginative variations in the story of—ix, x, 2, 4; -versions of—xi, 42

Rasa—2, 7; -change of story to suit—2; -in Vākya —7; -in Prabandha—7; -aviyoga—7; -doṣa —27, 28; -aṅga—28; -Adbhuta—19, 26; -Raudra 26, 77; -Karuṇa—26, 27, 28; -dhvani—25

Rāvaṇa—12-20, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37-39, 40, 42, 44, 48, 53, 54, 56, 60, 63, 64, 68-72, 77, 78-80, 83, 85, 90-92, 96, 100, 103

Rāvaṇa's dream (motif)—93

Raudra-Rasa—26, 77

Śabda—8

Sādhana—86

Śakti—28, 45, 100, 101

Samagra, variety of Nāṭaka—29

Sambhoga, variety of Śṛṅgāra—64

Saṁvaraṇa—57

Sandhis—60, 66, 68; -Nirvahaṇa—9, 10, 20, 25, 61, 72, 80; -Vimarśa—19, 68, 78, 79; -Garbha 45, 67; -Pratimukha—55, 64; -Mukha—62; Antarasandhi—76; -Anusandhi, minor sandhis or sub-sandhis—89, 90

Sandhyaṅgas: Chalana—11, 19; Anumāna—11, 19; Upakṣepa—12, 62; Anunaya—15; Toṭaka—17, Vidrava—30, 43, 45; Kāvyasaṁhāra—31; Praśasti —31, 80; Nirodha—52; Kāryamīmāṁsā—52; Vilāsa—64; Parisarpa—63; Virodha—65; Puṣpa

—65; Bījodghāṭana—66; Upanyāsa—66; Anumāna—67; Apavāda—69; Niyata-phala-prāpti—71; Grathana—72
Saṅghātyaka, an Aṅga of Sāttvatī-vṛtti—78, 79
Śaṅkā (Drava)—43, 45
Saṅkīrṇa-Viṣkambha—86
Sanskrit Literature, history of—vi; -dramas (plays) in—vi, 23, 93; -classes of—vii; -theatre—vii; -dramaturgy—vii ff, 26; -loss of works in—vi; -reconstruction of—ii, xi, xii ff; -works of Poetics—26
Śāntigṛha—27, 42
Śāpa, as a motif. See Curse.
Sārūpya-Lakṣaṇa—53, 98
Śatānanda—66
Śatṛughna—54
Sāttvatī-Vṛtti—77, 78, 80; -Saṅghātyaka, its Aṅga —78-79; -Parivartaka, an Aṅga—80
Season, Autumn—20, 70; -Varṣākāla (Rains)—20, 70, 82, 99; -Śaradṛtu—53; -Anuvṛtti, a stage of a season—87
Setu—77; -Causeway—77, 90, 94
Sītā—4, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16-19, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33-40, 45-48, 51, 52, 55-58, 59, 60-67, 70-74, 76-78, 83-85, 96, 102, 103
'Social Play in Sanskrit'—viii
Śravyakāvya—29
Śrīgadita, variety of Uparūpaka—85, 86
Śṛṅgāra; Vipralambha—25, 41; -Sambhoga—64
Stage-property—18
Sthāpaka-sūtradhāra—33
Sthāyibhāva—19, -Vismaya—19

Sūcābhinaya—89
Sugrīva—10, 16, 17, 20, 22, 40, 42, 67, 68, 70, 89, 90, 99
Sumāya, an emissary of Lavaṇa—56, 57
Śūrpaṇakhā—11, 12, 13, 22, 26, 27, 33-35
Sūrya—68
Sūtradhāra—9, 29, 33; -Sthāpaka—33
Svayaṁvara—63, 65
Svecchā—5
Tejas, a quality of the hero—80
Theatre, Sanskrit, richness of—vii
Toṭaka, Sandhyaṅga—17
Trāsa—45
Trijaṭā—46, 70, 98
Triśirāḥ—15
Udayana-theme—98 fn.
Ulkāmukha—96
Upakṣepa, Sandhyaṅga—12, 62
Upanyāsa, Sandhyaṅga—66
Uparūpaka, -Śrīgadita—85, 86
Utpādya (innovation) in story—ix, x, 85
Utthāpana—38, 39
Vaimānikas—31
Vajra, Sandhyaṅga—16, 55
Vākya, rasa in—7; -guṇas in—7
Vāli—x, 4, 5, 6, 16, 40, 70, 99
Vālmīki—10, 50, 57, 58
Varṣakāla-viraha—20
Vastu (plot)—60, 86, 101
Vibhīṣaṇa—10, 20, 23, 48, 72, 73, 78, 79, 96, 100
Vidrava, Sandhyaṅga—30, 45. See Drava.
Vidyādharas—23, 31
Vilāpa—21, 22, 41

Vilāsa; Sandhyaṅga—64
Vimarśa, Sandhi—19, 68, 78, 79
Vinīta, type of poet—85
Vipralambha (Śṛṅgāra)—25, 41, 69; Pūrvānurāga—63
Viraha—20, 76
Virodha, a Sandhyaṅga—65
Visarpa—99
Vismaya, Sthāyi-Bhāva—19
Viṣkambhaka—12; -characteristics of—13, 16, 58; -(prelude)—32, 33; -Saṅkīrṇa—86
Vīthyaṅga, Avagalita—50, 51; -Avasyandita—51, 52; -Asatpralāpa—14, 16; Chala—98; Gaṇḍa—76
Viyoga—84
Vṛtti, -Sāttvatī—77, 78, 80; -Ārabhaṭī—26, 43, 44
Witchcraft (motif)—46, 47
Wind-God—76
Yajña (yāga), -Abhicāra—27, 42

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(with Abbreviations)

Anargharāghava of Murāri.

Abhinavabhāratī (Abhi. Bhā.).
Abhinavagupta's commentary on the Nāṭya Śāstra of Bharata. Ms., Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, and Edition partly published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series (GOS), 3 Volumes.

Aucityavicāracarcā of Kṣemendra.
Kāvyamālā, Gucchaka I.

'Kavīndravacanasamuccaya', Bibliotheca Indica.

Kāvyānuśāsana with commentary by Hemacandra.

Daśarūpakavyākhyā by Bahurūpamiśra.
Ms. in Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras. Noticed in a paper by V. Raghavan in the JOR, Madras, VIII, pp. 321–334.

Daśarūpakāvaloka (DRA) of Dhanika.
Nirnayasagar Press edn., 1897.

Dhvanyāloka (Dhva. Ā.) of Ānandavardhana with the Locana of Abhinavagupta.
Nirnayasagar Press edn., 1928.

Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa (NLRK) of Sāgaranandin.
Text, Oxford University Press, 1937; English Translation, Introduction, Notes etc., The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia–6.

Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND) of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra. GOS.

Nāṭya Śāstra (NS) of Bharata.
Kāvyamālā and Kāśī edns.

Prasannarāghava of Jayadeva.

Bhāvaprakāśa (Bhā. Pra.) of Śāradātanaya. GOS.

Rasaratnapradīpikā of Allarāja. Ed. by R. N. Dandekar, Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan Series, 1945.

Rasārṇavasudhākara (RAS) of Śiṅgabhūpāla.
Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (TSS)

Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki.

Vakroktijīvita (VJ) of Kuntaka.
Ms. in the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, and Edn. of S. K. De, Calcutta, 1928.

Śārṅgadharapaddhati, Bombay 1888.

Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa (Śṛ. Pra.) of Bhoja.
Ms. in the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras.

Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa (SKĀ) of Bhoja.
N. S. Press edn., 1925.

Sāhityadarpaṇa (SD) of Viśvanātha.
Nirnayasagar Press edition, 1922.

Subhāṣitaratnakośa of Vidyākara.
Edited by D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale. Harvard Oriental Series 42, 1957.

Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva, Bombay, 1886.

Suvṛttatilaka of Kṣemendra.
Kāvyamālā, Gucchaka II.

Sūktimuktāvali of Jalhaṇa.
Ms. in the Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, and Edn. in GOS.

Journal of Oriental Research (JOR), Madras.

The Sanskrit Drama, A. B. Keith. Oxford.

The Social Play in Sanskrit, V. Raghavan.
Indian Institute of World Culture, Bangalore, 1952.

Some Concepts of Alaṅkāra Śāstra, V. Raghavan.
Adyar Library, Adyar, 1942.

Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa, V. Raghavan.
Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay, 1940, 1945.

ERRATA

Page	Line	Read
19	15	Chalana
20	4 from bottom	दैवेन
22	1	-तलाहतिस्तव
29	9 from bottom	ND. P. 149
51	16	छलितरामे-सीता (छाया)
,,	19	पिता ।
61	5 from bottom	practice
63	1	apostrophized
64	17	half-tilted
72	12	recapitulation
82	17	कलविङ्क॰
101	9	apostrophizes